University of Alberta

Many homes for tourism: interacting mobilities of space, place, and spatialization in return home and second home mobilities

by

Allison Hui ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2007

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33132-3
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33132-3

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Using travel memoirs concerning second homes (cottages) and trips to previous homes in Asia, this study argues for a new theoretical basis for investigations of tourism, home, and mobility. Whereas previous studies leave tourism in isolated locations, reliant upon material infrastructures and marked by differences that are articulated in comparison to a distant home, this study argues for the importance of immaterial factors and the inherent mobility of tourism and home. Intangible structures of spatialization support and shape touristic engagements, and virtual places significantly affect and motivate touristic practices and mobilities. Furthermore, the idea of tourism as an engagement with change cannot be separated from the mobility and transit that introduce and make possible articulations of difference. Tourism and home must therefore be understood as mobile, possible in many spaces, and situated within networks of interconnected spaces and places that are continually recreated in relationship to each other.

Acknowledgment

This project has been nurtured within a network of spaces, places and mobilities. Thank you to my supervisor Rob Shields, who is a model of mobility. Your encouragement has helped me to undertake many rewarding physical and conceptual mobilities and to find opportunities for growth. Thank you to my colleagues at the University of Alberta, especially the members of my committee – Sara Dorow and Karen Fox – for providing support, sharing your time, and creating opportunities for intellectual mobility. This project could not have been completed without the support of a University of Alberta Master's Scholarship and a Canada Graduate Scholarship (Masters) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Finally, thank you to David for being a virtual home during our challenging negotiation of distance and mobilities.

Table of Contents

Chapter One:
Naming and moving beyond the boundaries of tourism and home **p.1**

Overview p.1
Leaving 'home' – circular journeys and the difficulty of 'tourism' p.2
Considering tourism within second home and return home mobilities p.6
Space, place, practices, and spatialization p.8
Negotiating spatializations of home p.10
Methods and chapter overview p.13

Chapter Two:
Second home and return home mobilities **p.18**

The growth of second homes p.18
Housing and development – space as a container, space to be mapped p.19
The difficulty of definition p.20
The difficulty of compiling statistics p.21
Owners and decisions – space as composed of characteristics and motivations p.22
The mythic and the conflict – space as cultural product and contested terrain p.23
Second homes as spaces of tourism and mobility p.24
Return home mobilities within return migrations p.28
Return visits, returning home p.30
Return and tourism p.33
Conclusion p.34

Chapter Three:

New faces of the touristic **p.36**

Change between spaces, change within spaces p.36
Discourses on tourism p.40
Constructing second home roles and knowledge p.40
Constructing returnee roles and knowledge p.42
Along the continuum of touristic practices p.44
A tale of two tourisms p.46
Up the Crow River p.46
The search for Ermine Lake p.48
Structures of tourism p.49
Places, space, and spatializations p.52
Conclusion p.55

Chapter Four:

Over time and space – connections between spaces, places, and practices **p.56**

Interacting with mobile places p.56
Tracing connections – situating touristic practices in mobilities of place and space p.60
Mobilities and visiting the pandas p.60
Moving through Palladian places p.61
Connections to place and changing experiences at/of home p.64
Mobile constructions of place, networks and nodes of spatialization p.66
Conclusion p.67

Chapter Five:

Interactions and intersections of tourism and home **p.70**

Touring others' lives p.70
Labeling mobilities p.72
Revisiting places over passages of time – incorporating the changes of transit p.73
Tourism throughout mobilities – towards new epistemologies and methodologies p.79
Conclusion p.83

Chapter Six:

Visions and challenges for tourism **p.86**

Openings for new theorizations of tourism p.86
Openings for theorizing home p.91
Privilege, assumed mobilities, and the operations of power p.95
Conclusion p.98

Endnotes **p.100**

Bibliography **p.109**

Chapter One – Naming and moving beyond the boundaries of tourism and home

At a time when global mobilities and networks are increasingly opening up new areas and issues of investigation (cf. Castells, 2000) and societal interactions are affected by an increasing speed (Virilio, 1997), many areas of sociological study are in need of renewed investigation. Social concepts that were formulated with an understanding of communities as grounded and local are increasingly revealing their weaknesses when applied to societies that are now global and profoundly mobile (Albrow et al., 1997). In this way, mobilities have opened up space for renewed consideration in many areas of study.

Global mobilities of people, including migrations and leisure mobilities, have begun to challenge prevalent conceptualizations of tourism. Though mobilities are incorporated into many twenty-first century lives and lifestyles, they have not similarly come to inform the way we understand and study tourism. Rather than allowing these mobilities to inform our treatments of tourism, too many studies have remained implicitly dependent upon a view of tourism as circular travel patterns emanating from a stationary geographic home. Once migrations and other complex mobilities are taken into account, however, the demarcation of a home space that stands in opposition to a tourism space becomes fraught with difficulties. For this reason, it has become necessary to re-examine the relationship between mobilities, travel and tourism.

Overview

This paper engages with the gaps between prevalent framings of tourism and the practices and understandings of complex touristic mobilities. By employing an understanding of tourism that is not dependent upon particular spatial relations or the completion of certain circular trajectories, the opportunities for a more flexible definition of tourism will be explored. In this introduction, I begin by outlining the geographically rooted and economically motivated definitions that have often been used to characterize tourism. After situating these definitions within particular intellectual and cultural traditions, I highlight their limitations in addressing present mobilities. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the theoretical and methodological context of this study, and a brief outline of the major findings.

This study grows out of a concern about the epistemological and methodological groundings of studies of tourism. While global mobilities have a profound effect on tourism as an object of study, they also centrally affect conceptualizations of tourism, which in turn are used to ground studies of tourism. Basing tourism then on understandings rooted in the practices and realities of tourism as understood in previous decades has an affect on the epistemological basis of our studies. It is for this reason that we must take time to reconsider tourism as a phenomenon that is uniquely shaped within the complex global mobilities of the 21st century. Only by considering tourism in light of the complexities of current mobilities can we formulate studies that are open to all the nuances of touristic phenomena in current practices, spaces, and places. As Chris Rojek argues, epistemological questions concerning the rules and structures of tourist

experiences "are much more important than is generally recognized" (1997, p. 55) and thus theoretical work in this area cannot be ignored.

Leaving 'home' – circular journeys and the difficulty of 'tourism'

Part of the difficulty in formulating an inclusive definition of tourism arises because of different approaches to tourism. Burkart and Medlik note that tourism can be understood through either conceptual or technical definitions (1981, p. 41). As a concept, tourism can be marked by broad qualifications that separate it from other phenomena, but technical definitions also exist which are geared towards obtaining statistics and prognostics of tourism (Hall and Page, 2001). These two approaches, while distinguishable, can also become conflated. Conceptual distinctions that separate tourism from other phenomena can easily become equated or conflated with those that allow for quantifiable statistical measures.

Tourism has been predominantly operationalized based on space and time criteria. That is, tourism occurs in spaces away from home or a usual residence, and on trips that exceed specific distance and time criteria. The Statistics Canada Canadian Travel Survey, for example, defines a tourist trip as being "at least 80 km one-way from home", and not lasting longer than one year (Statistics Canada, in Svenson, 2004). The World Tourism Organization also rests its work on such quantifiable movements, and in one document argues that "the concept of usual environment is undoubtedly the basic foundation that supports the conceptual structure of tourism as a scope of analysis in itself" (World Tourism Organization, 2005, p. 49). In order to distinguish tourism from everyday activities then, it has been quantified as movement that is outside the everyday spatial realm, and thus tourism becomes marked by particular circular journeys.

Many conceptual investigations of tourism are also concerned, however, with circular movement. MacCannell, in his influential work *The Tourist*, names authenticity as a major driving factor of tourism, and states that "tours are circular structures, and the last destination is the same as the point of origin: home" (1976, p. 168). John Urry shifts focus from authenticity to an examination of what he calls the 'tourist gaze', but also names tourism as travel to, and a temporary stay within, sites that are "outside the normal places of residence and work", and states that a "clear intention to return 'home' within a relatively short period of time" is a key characteristic of tourism (1990, p. 3). The notion that tourism is away from home, temporary, and not connected to work thus grounds many examinations of touristic phenomena (cf. Hall and Page, 2001, pp. 58-59).

Defining tourism according to distance criteria and the condition of leaving one's home is centrally an exercise in defining acceptable tourist spaces. Though tourism may still be described as a phenomenon, placing a minimum distance as a definitional criterion turns the exercise into one of mapping. Home becomes the starting point, and then a decision line is drawn at a prescribed radius from this home. In this way, all spaces within a mapped circle become unfit spaces for tourism. Only those spaces beyond the circle have the ability to be named tourist spaces. Most often, this has resulted in the examination of

mass tourism destinations – resorts, attractions, and landmarks – and the practices of tourism within these sites have then been analyzed.

Support for this characterization of home-based and circular tourist mobilities has been found in many different areas. Ontologically, home has often carried a strong connotation as the foundational site of Western identities. Not only do homes or usual residences act as predominant sites in which individuals interact, but they also come to be seen as intimately connected to individual identities. There is something to be said for the connection of spaces and identities, but to presume the centrality of home to identity, and to take this relationship as a rule is to elide the diversity within experiences of home. Firstly, there are culturally diverse understandings of home and its relationship to rooted identity, and these complicate some understandings of the role of home in lives and mobilities, as I will discuss further below. Secondly, the positive and nostalgic relationships that can be assumed to follow from the home as site of identity fail to leave space for instances of ambivalence and discomfort at home (Burman, 2006b; Fortier, 2001). The roles homes play in identity are complex, and circular trips implicitly attribute an importance to static homes that can be misleading.

Functionalist theories also support this home-based circular characterization of tourism. Tourism is seen to be separate from everyday life, and therefore productive because of this separation. As Cohen notes, "tourism only remains functional, so long as it does not become central to the individual's life-plan and aspirations – since only so long will it regulate his tensions and dissatisfactions, refreshing and restoring him, without destroying his motivation to perform the tasks of his everyday life" (1979, p. 181). Indeed, holding a more central role for tourism would mark an individual as 'deviant', as someone shirking his or her responsibilities to society (Cohen, 1979, p. 181). A circular understanding of tourist trips is thus needed in order to mark off tourism as peripheral to everyday life.

Relating travel to home is a prevalent theme in much academic work. As Georges Van Den Abbeele has noted, travel has long been associated with positive change. Young men were sent on Grand Tours in Europe starting in the 19th Century as a way of educating and maturing them for roles within cultured society. The positive effects that were seen to come from travel were a prime motivator for these trips. Indeed, the circularity of these trips was deemed crucial to accounting for growth: "the educational voyage is thus especially dependent upon its completion, upon the *return home* of the neophyte who sets out on the grand tour; otherwise, the value of its formative lessons may be lost or reduced to naught" (Van Den Abbeele, 1992, p. 86). Measuring positive change though is an economic type of activity that privileges one reference point and then is driven by the need to quantify gains in respect to that point of comparison (Van Den Abbeele, 1992, p. xviii). A home, which Van Den Abbeele refers to using the Greek *oikos*, must stand as a reference against which travel can be understood. Home not only allows a distinction between tourism and everyday life then, but also provides a point of comparison so that positive changes that come from travel and tourism can be measured upon one's return home.

Though any point within a mobility path could be used to compare the positive gains of travel, home has taken precedence in studies of tourism. The power of this reference point is great, for it can act "as a transcendental point of reference that organizes and domesticates a given area by defining all other points in relation to itself" (Van Den Abbeele, 1992, p. xviii). By not mobilizing this point of reference, but rather grounding it in one geographical home, studies of tourism have been vulnerable to considering only particular interpretations of the unfamiliar individuals and objects encountered in tourism mobilities. "The privileging of the *oikos* in the economy of travel not unsurprisingly underpins the ethnocentrism and imperialism that have consistently marked Western thought even in its best efforts to "comprehend" the other" (Van Den Abbeele, 1992, p. xxv). Postcolonial literature has addressed this supremacy of home and the ways in which class, race, and gender are written into conceptualizations of travel. Considering the colonial relationship between England and India, Grewal points out the way in which a Euroimperial model of travel constructs subjects based on racialized differences, and by so doing questions how traveling Indian men and women fit into this model (1996). Travel discourses also construct particular ways of gazing upon racialized others based on European models of scientific objectivity and romanticism, as Pratt has shown (1992). Postcolonial scholars have illustrated the way in which tourism and travel writing are conceptually shaped by presuppositions about European homes, which are connected to histories of colonialism and imbalances of power. Studies of tourism are predominantly grounded in homes that are situated within such Euroimperial discourses, and their insights remain bolstered by ethnocentrism and imperialism. The need to move beyond such negative conceptual underpinnings is another reason the standard utilization of home-based geographies of tourism must be re-examined.

Though home-based definitions of tourism well represent the educational gains of Grand Tour trips and highlight important factors of many vacation mobilities, they fail to encompass the particularities of the diverse mobilities practiced today. National and international migration are significant social phenomena that affect populations. From a geographic perspective, migration multiplies the number of spaces that can be called 'homes' or 'usual residences', and thus brings into question the naming of only one location to ground tourism mobilities. Premising touristic activities upon the recognition of one home then is a simplification that erases the operation of multiplicities of home.

Furthermore, what has been called the 'time-space compression' of the twenty-first century profoundly affects understandings of everyday spheres. Communicative technologies have shrunk perceived global distances at the same time that transportation developments have decreased the time requirements for traversing actual global distances. Such developments have changed the nature of everyday life so that it is no longer bounded in a particular spatial location, but can incorporate communication with individuals across the globe through mediums such as the telephone and internet, along with an understanding that routines need not be embedded in particular localities, but can rather travel and be reproduced in diverse spatial locations (Albrow, 1997). These trends foster new spatializations of social interactions, and challenge any geographic determination of a phenomenon such as tourism because the possible spatial components of everyday life are potentially very diverse.

Hall, while addressing the changing sphere of everyday life, notes that mobilities of leisure and business can often be voluntary and fit definitions of tourism, while also being routine parts of life that can happen monthly or even daily (Hall, 2005a, p. 95). Furthermore, the amount of time needed to travel distances has shrunk, and as a result "what were once overnight trips can now be done as daytrips, while what could once only be undertaken as a domestic trip in a given time can now be done internationally" (Hall, 2005a, p. 96). Thus, now even in non-migrant populations, the spatial mobilities of everyday life can have many complexities not well addressed by circular representations of tourism.

In addition to being a challenge for individuals whose mobilities include multiple homes, the notion of home-based tourism mobilities is also problematic because of its cultural specificity. Philosophical remnants of the Enlightenment tend to support the valuation of mobilities (Kaplan, 2003, p. 211), but these mobilities remain rooted in understandings of identity as something grounded in one location. Such an ontology often becomes reflected in research despite acknowledgements of the multiple spatial, relational, and political facets of home (De Souza, 2005, p. 137). As Hammond notes, Western conceptions of home are often unsuitable in studies examining other cultural and spatial contexts (2004). In her study of Ethiopian citizens from the region of Tigray who returned to Ethiopia after time spent in exile, Hammond notes that in the Tigrinya language there are many words that represent the different aspects eclipsed under the English term 'home' (2004, p. 41). To speak only using the Western "discourse on homecoming" which privileges one home above all others is not representative of the experience or the language of these people (Hammond, 2004, p. 37). Formulating tourism from a grounded and formative home thus risks eliding the cultural particularities of home.

Even within the West, it can be argued that privileging one home has been accomplished only at the ignorance of other important cultural experiences. Second homes, for example, are important sites of emotional attachment and economic investment for many individuals, and "to necessarily privilege one (usually the urban work place) as primary, central, and everyday and the other as secondary, peripheral, and exotic seems unwarranted" (Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999, p. 228). From this perspective, denoting one place as everyday while the other is extraordinary becomes an arbitrary task (Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999) and one that is unrepresentative of the varied experience of individuals in multiple spaces. There are much more complex relationships with spaces and places, and the relational aspects of home need to be considered not only within studies of migration, but also studies of tourism (cf. Ahmed et al., 2003, p. 8).

All of these challenges highlight the difficulties inherent in home-grounded definitions of tourism. Though it is common now to exchange 'home' for a more generic spatial reference such as 'the space of usual residence', and this substitution allows one to retain understandings of circular tourist mobilities even for migrants, there are still unique features of these mobilities that are obscured by such a definition. Furthermore, the idea of a usual residence can hide complexities of recurrent mobilities (Behr and Gober in Bell and Brown, 2006, p. 78). Just as routine travel mobilities can expand the sphere of usual

interaction to global spaces, the previous residence of immigrants in other spaces can give mobilities a unique mixture of routine and exceptional activities and experiences.

In this way, changes associated with globalization have disturbed longstanding assumptions of social concepts that are rooted in particular geographical spaces and formations. Concepts of culture, community, home, and identity are now much more mobile and complex in experiences, and "this makes increasingly problematic our assumptions of singular place identities and geographic rootedness as starting points from which to build social theories to explain tourism, leisure, and identity" (Williams, 2002, p. 356). In light of globalization then, sociological concepts must become detached from spatial references, while also being disaggregated or extended as new social practices require (Albrow et al., 1997).[1] Within studies of tourism this challenge has required a reconsideration of tourism itself. Spatial and cultural concerns have led Iain Chambers to suggest that tourism must be understood not as bounded travel that is linked to a static geographic home, but through the framework of a fluid migrancy (1994). Similarly, C. Michael Hall has called for a revision of definitions that will allow tourism, leisure and other worldly movements to be examined simultaneously (2005b). Though addressing mobilities has often been left to specialized areas of study such as tourism and migration, it needs to be acknowledged as a key facet of social life more generally (Hastrup and Olwig, 1997, p. 6; Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999). More investigation is needed then into the role of global mobilities as building blocks for understandings of tourism.

Considering tourism within second home and return home mobilities

This study thus suggests that technical definitions of tourism have contributed to the definition of tourism geographically, in relation to spaces of home or usual residence, and that these definitions fail to include the diverse experiences of and relationships between spaces and tourism. Conceptual discussions of tourism, though not dependent upon technical definitions, often have fallen into similar understandings of tourism mobilities and the opposition of tourism and home spaces. Though there is an important relationship between attachments to and experiences of homes and tourism, this relationship mustn't be examined only in cases that fit certain geographic definitions.

For this reason then, this study moves beyond traditional examinations of iconic or mainstream tourism in order to take inspiration from work on transnationalism and consider cases that have been previously labeled as marginal tourism. It has long been recognized that tourism is a complex concept that incorporates many different types of activities, yet studies of tourism have continued to be focused upon the limit cases of tourism – purpose-built resorts, theme parks, etc. While niches of tourism studies have begun to look at various areas such as ecotourism and heritage tourism, these studies are often still supported by theorizations of tourism that take only paradigmatic tourism practices and mobilities into consideration. In order to better theorize tourism as something practiced by mobile individuals who traverse many diverse spaces, marginal and potentially non-traditional tourist roles and sites must be examined. Such cases allow an examination of the interaction of tourism and migration within global mobilities, and

will contribute to building a new theoretical basis for addressing the complexities of twenty-first century touristic practices, spaces, and places.

The concept of marginal cases of tourism comes from the work of Eric Cohen. Cohen suggests that there are gradations of tourist roles that stretch from the 'fully-fledged' tourist to more marginal roles (1974). Thus, he recognizes that "instead of a clearly bounded phenomenon, tourism upon closer inspection turns out to be vaguely delimited and to merge imperceptibly with other types of traveller rôles" (Cohen, 1974, pp. 527-528). It is crucial, therefore, that the sociology of tourism merge with the sociology of travellers (Cohen, 1974, p. 528). Despite the many years that have passed since this assertion, little has been done to facilitate this connection. Much more recently, Coles et al. have made the argument that an awareness of global movements and mobilities has not been adequately incorporated into tourism studies as characteristics of not only tourists, but individuals (2005). Tourists have been acknowledged as travellers who are mobile in order to practice tourism, but this step is still insufficient because we must also understand how tourists are individuals who can be more widely mobile.

One of the reasons little progress has been made towards integrating sociologies of travel and tourism is that, as Cohen points out, most studies have remained focused upon the fully-fledged tourist, while ignoring those occupying marginal tourist roles, such as business travellers, pilgrims, and old-country visitors (1974). As a result, issues of migrancy and more complex mobilities have been overlooked within studies of tourism, and valuable insights within studies of migration and transnationalism remain disconnected from work on tourism. These insights must be connected, not only to draw attention to many types of mobilities, but also to recognize the way unequal access to different sources of capital exclude some groups from considerations of tourism (see further discussion in Chapter Six). Hall and Williams also point to a lack of data and shaky theoretical foundations as factors that have hindered research on mobility and tourism (2002a, p. 3). It is important that this connection of mobility and tourism be pursued, in order to better understand all aspects of tourism within mobile societies. Following Cohen and Coles et al., this study continues the work of engaging with the connection between travellers and tourism.

To this end, I have chosen two cases that can be seen to represent marginal tourist roles and spaces: second home mobilities and return home mobilities. Return home mobilities encompass the travel of individuals to locations of previous residence. For example, if a woman who resided in Hong Kong for the first twenty years of her life later immigrated to Canada, her subsequent trips back to Hong Kong could be understood as examples of return home tourism. Second home mobilities, on the other hand, consist of trips to non-primary residences. A common variant of this type of tourism involves trips to a family cottage. Both of these cases are unique because while the mobilities they describe have been termed 'tourism' (Hall and Müller, 2004b; Lew and Wong, 2005), they do not fit many technical definitions, and are marked by complex relationships with migrancies and homes. As a result, not only the practices, but also the spaces and places in which they occur become difficult to categorize.

Rather than referring to these cases as second home tourism and return home tourism, I have chosen to use the term 'mobilities' to draw attention to the movement inherent in these practices, as well as to allow more freedom for characterizing practices and spaces within these mobilities as alternately touristic or non-touristic. Detaching the touristic label from a geographic mobility or movement as a whole is a key step towards detaching tourism from geographic conceptualizations. While it may still be valuable to characterize the motivations behind certain mobilities as touristic, any generic labeling of segments of mobility as tourism serves to reinforce spatially-based criteria of inclusion that need now to be challenged.[ii] Mobilities are simultaneously creating and recreating relationships with many places and conceptualizations of spaces, and thus conceptual understandings of tourism and home cannot be limited spatially because any chosen spatial boundaries would be inconsistent with the processes by which they are enacted. Practices and spatializations of tourism and home are not constructed in isolated spaces or by solely tangible means. As the following chapters will show, it is therefore crucial that we now move beyond a map of acceptable spaces of tourism and home and consider manifestations of the touristic and home as spatially mobile, tangible and intangible, and dependent upon relationships and differences that are established through the negotiation of multiple spaces and places.

In extending my study to mobilities and roles that have been labeled as marginally touristic, space is opened to examine both diverse practices of tourism and varied spaces and places of tourism and mobility. Just as iconic tourism roles have been a primary object of study, so too have paradigmatic tourist spaces consumed a great deal of attention. This focus is important, as major tourist attractions such as the Eiffel Tower and the Great Wall of China have become significant social and symbolic phenomena, but it can also distract from the particular practices within these sites. As Craik notes, these marked tourism sites are often used more by local patrons than by non-locals, just as local shopping malls or cultural communities can be visited by non-locals more often than by locals (1997, p. 121). Such examples suggest that the equation of non-locals and tourism sites has served to distract from potential touristic activities and touristic spaces. The touristic will thus be examined in this study within a framework of space, place, and practices.

Space, place, practices, and spatialization

The relationship between space, place, and practices is an important consideration within this reexamination of tourism and mobilities. Space, as treated here, consists of static material geographic locations, and is related to place, which is an immaterial entity arising from the placing, ordering, and representing of material objects (Hetherington, 1997). Though human geographers have tended to describe place in terms of subjective assessments of space, that is, in terms of individual attachment that arises from giving space meaning (Williams and Patterson in Kaltenborn, 1997, p. 176), Hetherington notes that this definition fails to incorporate an understanding of the material objects involved (1997). Considering place then as something constituted in the placing, ordering, and representing of material objects emphasizes the interactive and embodied process of creating. Hetherington argues that "rather than taking a place as a site that stands for

something, that has intrinsic or mythic meaning because of its supposed fixity in space, we should think of places as relation, as existing in similitude: places as *being in the process of being placed in relation to* rather than being there"(1997, pp. 187-188). Subjective assessments and affective reactions are still acknowledged, but are seen to come from, and feed back into, the process of placing and ordering. As a result, place is created as an immaterial entity, consisting of representations and memories that can be mobile and experienced in many spaces. Places are thus virtual, in Shields' sense of being "real idealizations" that are immaterial, but not abstract, and which can be actualized into concrete forms through activities such as drawing pictures (2003).

To understand this distinction between space and place, consider the space of a house – a physical built structure that might be appropriately labeled with a street address, which denotes its mapped location. Space and place are distinct, and thus the space of the house does not become a place of 'home' until individuals have placed and ordered furniture in a particular way. Placing and arranging desks and examining tables within the house could result in a place of 'office' or 'clinic', whereas placing instead couches, beds, pictures and personal mementos would result in a place that is named as a 'home'. Though constituted through interactions with material objects, this place of home is immaterial and can travel with individuals to widely differing spaces in the mental images and memories that resulted from placing objects in the house. Spaces and places thus have a flexible relationship. While there may be a strong probability that some spaces are connected to certain types of places, this relationship is not deterministic. Houses are most often arranged into homes, but they are also sometimes offices. There is also no linear relationship between houses and homes, so one house is not necessarily only one home, and the spatialized limits of home need not correspond to the spatial limits of a house (Gough, 2007). Space and place are then independent factors of examination that are in constant relationship.

The role of practices follows from this relationship between space and place. Practices, embodied activities performed by individuals, occur in spaces. Furthermore, they can be understood to link spaces and places – that is, the placing of objects is a practice, and so places arise out of space through particular ordering practices. Practices undertaken in any one space, however, need not be related to the creation of place within that space. That is, individuals can inhabit one location, such as a dentist's office, and interact with the memories of an unrelated place, like a beach, just as surely as they can actively order and create the place of a medical office. Practices are also flexibly connected to places and spaces.

This relational framework of space and place fits well alongside the concept of spatialization developed by Shields (1991). Spatialization highlights the process by which space is socially constructed through the discursive and non-discursive practices of individuals (Shields, 1991, p. 7). Individuals interact with space and in so doing create a matrix of spatial meanings and values that are socially shared. This matrix of social meanings creates a system of differences that becomes entrenched in political and cultural ideologies. Spatial markers act as metaphors for cultural values, and create 'imagined geographies' upon which attributes such as good and bad, female and male,

are written. When these contrasts are "institutionalised or rendered as a natural division" (Shields, 1991, p. 261), they gain a persuasive influence upon further actions and help to facilitate practices that further entrench differences. Spatialized divisions can become influences that are taken for granted, but they can also be transformed by subsequent practices that break the performative codes attached to sites.

In summary then, as individuals move through various spaces and construct places through their practices, they are also constructing understandings and meanings of social space. Just as the connections between space, place, and practices are flexible, so too can practices support or challenge existing social spatializations. Though spatializations can act as persuasive influences, individuals can also choose to challenge the values and distinctions that are socially attributed to space.

Negotiating spatializations of home

As this introduction has established, the predominant understanding of tourism exists in opposition to the space of home because it is part of a larger spatialization that marks home as a center point that the tourist departs from and returns to. This framework is inadequate for addressing present formations of tourism, and must be reconsidered. The spatialized connection between tourism and home, however, suggests that any reconsideration of tourism must also involve a reconsideration of how home is spatialized, both as a primary residence and as an aspect of second home or return home mobilities.

In predominant Western ideologies, home has been spatialized as a personal, and highly feminized realm.[iii] Homes are constructed as the foundational site of families, where children are raised and family bonds anchored. The intimacy that is understood to characterize feminine practices of childrearing is also attributed to home itself, which becomes a space marked by care, belonging and safety. As families grow and age, the home remains spatialized as a site of constancy and continuity, repetition and family rituals. Examples of these aspects of spatialization abound in ideals of the perfect 1950s housewife, remnants of children's increasing height written on a doorjamb, narratives of returning home to share in family rituals during Christmas holidays, and even calls before Y2K to stock up on supplies so as to make the family home a bastion of security in case dire predictions of technological failure were to come true.

This idyllic and highly gendered spatialization of home is placed in contrast to public sites of otherness and the exotic. As McDowell notes, the nineteenth century marked a time in which the home came to be marked as the opposite of the early capitalist economy – it "was invested with a spiritual quality" and "became an idealized centre for emotional life"(1999, p. 75). In contrast to the domestic domain of the home, public spaces are constructed as male realms of work, populated by dangerous strangers and encounters with foreignness.[iv] This gendered spatialization impacts discourses of travel, which are coded as masculine and thereby leave female travellers in a space of exceptionality and uncertain self-definition (Wolff, 1993). The tradition of the Grand Tour is highly gendered, and though women now also participate, spatializations continue

to mark their participation as inappropriate.[v] The gendering of private and public spaces is therefore a prime example of the way in which spatialization can entrench moral values in spaces – in this case, the inappropriateness of women in non-home spaces.

Tourism cannot then remain bounded by circular mobility patterns, because such patterns fail to recognize how gender plays into the affect of home upon travel. Furthermore, gender can affect experience of tourism, such as when women remain responsible for 'housekeeping' tasks such as childcare and laundry, even when away from a physical home. Though gendered analyses are not a central part of this study, re-theorizing tourism holds possibilities for new insights about the gendering of tourism that will need to be studied further.

Beyond the context of the family, home is more broadly spatialized and used within political and cultural ideologies of the nation. Nation states and nationalism are centrally occupied with the enunciation of community, and such enunciations are often accomplished by creating shared connections to the country as a communal home space. Both Canadian and American national anthems refer the nation's land as home: "O Canada, our home and native land"(Weir, 1908) and "O say, does that star-spangled banner yet wave / O'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave?"(Key, 1814). In this context, the space of home becomes important because it is 'ours' – that is, a claimed possession. Home becomes a spatial marker of status (McDowell, 1999, p. 92), as well as a piece of property that must be guarded from invaders.[vi]

Though these spatializations of home continue to underlie many discourses, they have also been challenged in significant ways. Feminist activists and scholars have problematized the gendering of home, and have brought attention to the work of keeping house, which has often been elided within constructions that place home as a locale for repose from the outside world of work.[vii] Furthermore, though home is often spatialized as an intimate space of the family, many individuals experience significant conflicts and clashes within their families and within their homes. Home can thus be a space of pain or restriction rather than one of support and safety. Developing this idea, Fortier has commented on how queer homecomings can reveal homes to be challenging, unsafe, and unfamiliar (Fortier, 2001, 2003). The spatialized safety of home, as both a family space and a larger nation space, is not only challenged by personal experiences, but is also threatened by an increasing sense of vulnerability that has build up in response to attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, and the deterritorialized threat of SARS and avian flu. Though alternate spatializations have emerged to incorporate this new sense of risk at home, existing spatializations have also been adapted to downplay such articulations of difference. Political discourses in the United States and Canada have actively and aggressively worked to re-assure citizens of the safety of their public spaces after acts of terrorism or outbreaks of SARS destabilized societal confidence.

Spatializations of home thus continue to be contested and negotiated. Alternate spatializations of home exist within different communities, however home is predominantly considered to be an idyllic haven of homogeneity, intimacy, and safety.

For those who do not share this experience, home can become a site of continual negotiation and subversive spatialization.

Despite these negotiations, I suggest that it is possible to conceive of a more inclusive and open spatialization of home. What unites divergent spatializations of home is a sense of the possibilities that home spaces hold. In its most basic material form, home is spatialized as an infrastructure for activities such as sleeping, eating, and bathing. The possibility for accomplishing certain life activities is thus written onto home spaces. As well, home holds relational possibilities – that is, it is spatialized as a site in which one can interact with family and develop familial bonds, where one can host friends, and where a sense of belonging can allow one to more freely express personal opinions.[viii] Though such an open image of the spatialized form of home cannot be employed at the expense of the particularities of personal experience, this model facilitates a re-consideration of value judgments related to home, and thereby creates space for diverse understandings of how home relates to other spaces and places within studies of tourism and mobilities.

To distinguish then between spatializations of home and places of home, we can note that social spatializations are shared, and though they are informed by personal experience, they need not involve particular experiences. One can know that homes are supposed to be safe spaces, that is, they are spatialized as such, even without personal experience to corroborate this statement. Creating places of home is a more personal practice, one that interacts with the infrastructure and possibilities laid out in spatializations, but which also requires a certain period of personal interaction during which one establishes differences through placing and ordering material things. Thus, places of home are created in the process of manipulating material things to create opportunities for something that is deemed central to the space of home – sleeping, reading, watching television, or doing yoga. These requirements – the things that are central to the space of home – stem from the persuasion of spatialization and the preferences of personal experience, and their importance is strengthened by repeated visits and interactions in the physical space or the virtual place of home. Thus, since spatializations and places of home are mobile, many homes can be established, if desired, in diverse locations, through similar processes of placing and creating possibilities for the practices of home.

Though activities within home spaces are important to the placing and spatialization of home, homes must not be understood as things created only within home spaces. Establishing a place of home, or a social spatialization of home, requires the enunciation of difference, and this difference is established by leaving home. That is, it is the mobility of individuals to non-home places that allows them to place home in relation to other spaces of difference. This relationship suggests that just as familiar experiences at home allow the recognition of exceptionality and the labeling of 'other' during travel, so to do encounters with 'other' create and reinforce the familiarity of home.

Though establishing differences is an oft-cited characteristic of travel mobilities, global flows of goods and information have facilitated the enunciation of difference even at home. New influxes of foreign media, technology, and cultural practices have opened up

possibilities for interacting with difference even within the familiarity of a nation or community. Refugees and migrants are also significant within this process. These groups come to inhabit familiar home spaces, bringing with them cultural differences and rituals that provide opportunities for touristic encounters at home.[ix] The bias within Western spatializations towards singular homes contributes to interpretations of such encounters, and thus refugees and migrants are often symbolically fixed to the spaces of their originating homes. As such, they become markers of exceptionality that help to define home through difference. Though the presence of such groups may become a familiar aspect of national home spaces, their presence is rarely seen to be affective and transformative of home (cf. Burman, 2006b), but rather remains a safe enunciation of difference, thanks to their comparative lack of power and resources within the home community.

In light of the predominance of idyllic spatializations of home that are entrenched in binaries, the use of 'home' in the labels 'second home' and 'return home mobilities' is both helpful and problematic. It distinguishes these cases from other mobilities by virtue of their connection to sites of importance and previous residence. This distinction, however, also relies heavily on the spatializations of home that this project questions. Indeed, the use of 'second home' and 'primary home' as labels threatens to uphold the oppositional duality that is often attributed to these categories. Thus, the negotiations and spatializations of home outlined in these cases are objects of analysis, alongside primary concerns regarding tourism. Second home and primary home spaces and places are addressed, but not seen to be inherently oppositional. Rather, they are examined to help deconstruct any notion of the primacy of one home over another and to achieve a discussion of homes and tourism as mobile, transitory, and similar spaces and places.

The primary concern of this project then is to uncover aspects of tourism that have been neglected because they do not fit into circular mobilities of tourism, and to use these to imagine new possibilities for spatializations of tourism. Circular models depend on singular homes and houses, and do not fit many individuals' experiences. Furthermore, they suggest that homes are the only spaces and places that are important to grounding understandings of tourism. By considering cases that involve multiple homes, this project engages with different tourism mobilities, and considers the importance of primary homes, second homes, previous homes, and other spaces and places to experiences of tourism. Though primary homes are important to individuals in many ways, the following chapters will illustrate that other spaces are also important, and can impact tourism. Focusing on cases with multiple homes will show that though home is an important factor in experiences of tourism, especially in the cases selected here, it is not the only one, and thus cannot be the lynchpin for geographies of tourism.

Methods and chapter overview

The ensuing chapters examine theoretically important insights that arose from a close reading of travel memoirs dating from the late twentieth century. The sampling of travel memoirs for this project was theoretically driven, and works were sought which facilitated an understanding of the two cases. A personal interest in return home

mobilities to Asia guided the concentration of one case within this continent,[x] and the style and content of memoirs was taken into consideration, with a preference given to texts containing detailed narratives that spoke at length about return trips. There are five substantial memoirs included in this study (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977; Chiang, 1977; Gable and Gable, 2005; MacGregor, 2002; Phillips, 1990), along with several other supportive texts (Bainbridge, 2002; Gordon, 1989, 2006; Liu, 2005; MacGregor, 2005).[xi] These texts represent diverse geographies of mobility, as well as diverse experiences with home. MacGregor's second home is a cottage in Algonquin Park, Ontario, Canada, while the Gables purchase the Villa Cornaro, a second home that is also a significant architectural landmark in Italy. Chiang and Phillips both write about their experiences of returning to China after having migrated from the country earlier in their lives. For Chiang, his return to China consists of one trip to visit diverse parts of the country. Phillips, on the other hand, makes several trips, for both work and leisure, over the course of many years. The last of the primary texts is a memoir by Blaise and Mukherjee, Canadian academics who recount their family's return to Mukherjee's previous homes in India.

Theoretical engagement with these cases was driven by a concern for the practices, spaces, and places of each case (cf. Fortier, 1999; Freeman, 2002; Shields, 1991). Acknowledging that the representations of space and time within conceptions of tourism are actively constructed through discourse, this study sought to query the relationships that are represented in academic studies and in memoirs addressing marginal touristic mobilities. The differences between these representations were taken to be theoretically important, and were thus used to theorize new spatializations of tourism.

Through a critical reading, a composite picture was derived of the predominant framings of second home and return home mobilities. Critical discourse analysis (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Fairclough, 2003; Potter and Wetherell, 1994; Potter, 1996) was also used to aid analysis. Following critical discourse analysis, the memoirs were regarded as forms of practice themselves, and ones that actively construct particular relationships and values. Critical discourse analysis allows us to identify the relationships that are constructed through discourse between spaces and places in touristic mobilities. Rather than including a detailed presentation on critical discourse analysis, this study used it as a tool to expose the differences in how relationships between spaces, place, and practices of tourism are represented in tourism memoirs and in academic studies of tourism. In particular, several questions Fairclough names in his work on textual analysis were used to investigate the texts' orientations to difference, assumptions, discourses, representations of social events, relationships between time and space, and themes (Fairclough, 1992, 2003). Examining and comparing the memoirs revealed constructions of space and place in tourism that have not been addressed in many academic studies, and which deserve more attention in the future.

This study's goal of re-examining and challenging current conceptualizations of tourism could have been accomplished by first considering issues of race or culture, and then challenging the way in which tourism does not speak to experiences that are further outside the predominant Eurocentric and colonial ideology of tourism. A choice was

made, however, to situate this study closer to the power of academic and mainstream tourism discourses, in the hopes of disturbing the apparent facticity of these discourses from within. Other studies that start from analyses of the racial and colonial inequalities within tourism discourses would make great companions to this work, and would bring valuable contributions regarding how the conclusions of this study might support and open spaces for work that further challenges the problems within discourses of tourism.

The use of two cases consisting of diverse memoirs does not limit the value of this study. Rather, analyzing the way in which these memoirs construct relationships between space, place, and practices of tourism provides a composite picture of the type of issues and relationships that have been overlooked in academic discourses on tourism. Each case has a different relationship to homes, and therefore highlights different aspects of possible relationships between tourism and homes in mobilities. These cases then provide an opportunity to consider what tourism looks like when it is situated in relationship to a primary and second home, or when it is connected to a primary home and a former home. Both of these cases provide insights not found in models with a singular home, and together they help to suggest how tourism might be inclusive of diverse mobilities and connections to homes. Thus, diverse cases and memoirs provide opportunities to consider different theoretical gaps that can exist between discourses on tourism. Even if they are not common to all types of tourism, these gaps must be addressed within future theorizations of tourism and mobilities.

The insights of this study are also colored by the privilege of memoir authors. This privilege is betrayed by authors' assumptions that it is easy and unremarkable to be mobile and undertake extensive travel. Thus, while analysis was undertaken with an attention to power, the cases of this study cannot speak to a broad range of socio-economic experiences and levels of privilege. The insights of this study are not, however, applicable to only privileged experiences of tourism. It is not particular practices of tourism, which might be inaccessible for some individuals, but rather the geographies of tourism and relationships between space, place, and practices that are central to this study. Therefore, insights from this study, such as the way tourism can exist in many spaces and mobilities, will be useful for future examinations of both expensive and commoditized tourism, as well as tourism that is practiced closer to home and is therefore accessible to less-privileged individuals.

Finally, it is important to preface this work by noting the implicit importance of temporality to studies of mobility. The recent launch of the new journal 'Mobilities' is part of a trend towards considering mobilities as a distinct field of investigation. The area of mobility studies does not yet have an established canon, however it can be noted that there is a significant emphasis in mobilities work upon both spatial and temporal factors. This study primarily engages with the spatial aspects of tourism, but temporality remains an important issue that deserves further independent study. Touristic mobilities are affected by seasonal time, although this can be manifest differently in the mobilities of cottage owners and snowbirds. The networked space and place that this study presents suggest that future studies will need to consider how it is that longer temporal periods of mobility affect shorter seasonal or cyclical travel. Seasonal travel will also need to be

considered in relation to places and spaces, as potentially encouraging relationships between spaces and dual spatializations. Though time is not an explicit facet of this study, it remains important, and future work will need to consider more closely how time and space work together in mobilities of tourism.

The following chapter examines the existing literature on second home and return home mobilities. Second homes have been addressed as a housing and leisure phenomenon that is located in discrete locations. Mobilities, though often plotted or mapped to discover trends in ownership, are an overlooked component of existing second home investigations. Theoretical debates also rage in a small section of the literature over the inclusion or exclusion of second homes visits as a type of tourism. Acknowledging the importance of second home mobilities as sites for engaging with touristic change, this study suggests that mobility must not be only as a characteristic of second home visits, but rather must inform and transform understandings of tourism and second home experiences. Return home mobilities, on the other hand, have been predominantly studied within examinations of transnationalism and return migration. This work provides insights into the connections between diverse spaces, the obligations involved in return, and the complex relationships between migration and tourism. Though its emphasis upon the normalcy of complex mobility patterns is important, the affect of return home mobilities on conceptions of tourism has not been adequately considered. There is limited work that is relevant for the concerns of this study, but the cases are nonetheless rich locations in which to examine the relationship between tourism and mobilities.

Chapter Three delves into the theoretical insights uncovered during theoretical engagements with second home and return home memoirs. Moving beyond strict geographic limitations upon instances of tourism, the cases of this study demonstrate how tourism can be manifest as not only change between spaces, but also change incorporated into experiences within spaces. Even though memoir authors often separate themselves from tourists, their narratives reveal rich engagements with touristic change. Some touristic practices use established material tourism infrastructures, and it is suggested that others rely upon virtual infrastructures that support spatialized engagements with change.

Chapter Four considers the importance of interactions with mobile place, and how such interactions form a complex web of spaces and places over time. As texts from the study's memoirs show, connections to place can influence individuals' touristic practices in many spaces, and indeed can guide touristic mobilities. Similarly, touristic experiences and interactions with place can affect practices undertaken upon return to areas of usual residence, thus transforming experiences of places of home. In this way, spaces and places of tourism and home are fundamentally interconnected and interactive. These relationships emphasize the way in which places are constructed in many spaces, as well as being spatialized within a network of spatial nodes.

This network of spaces and places is considered further in the subsequent chapter. The relationships between tourism and home are probed, and mobilities are shown to involve very different experiences, depending on the individual characteristics of travellers. The particularity of touristic practices suggests that mobilities must not be seen as essentially

or entirely oriented towards tourism, but rather as occasionally characterized by tourism. Mobilities to familiar spaces can also involve significant 're-placing' as the changes and differences introduced through transit are incorporated into new understandings of places such as 'home'. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the need for methodologies that include multiple spaces and virtual places.

The final chapter reviews and situates a new approach to tourism and home. In addition to treating tourism and home as mobile, spatially dispersed, inextricable from mobilities, and comprising of material and virtual components, it is important to consider the role of intersectional characteristics and the heterogeneity of individuals in examinations of tourism and home. This chapter concludes with an important discussion of the biases and assumed privilege within the tourism industry and literature, and argues that though the cases and texts of this study are marked by similar problems, the theorization of tourism suggested in this study has the potential to include less privileged populations. Though the privilege and power are not a central focus of this study, they remain important issues for future research.

Chapter Two – Second home and return home mobilities

Second home mobilities and return home mobilities have been addressed in diverse ways within broad sets of academic literature. Second homes have been the focus of discussions concerning policy, leisure, and development. Trips to previous homes, meanwhile, have been examined as a byproduct of migration, as well as within the context of diasporas and transnationalism. Before addressing the particularities of my cases, I will briefly trace the development of these literatures addressing second homes and return home mobilities. This overview will demonstrate that though research has gradually incorporated greater social and cultural complexities into discussions of second homes and return home trips, the mobility of those participating is often treated as a characteristic, rather than a component that can transform understandings of each case. Similarly, the sparse literature that does speak to the touristic components of these mobilities engages more with the insights they bring to previous conceptions of tourism, rather than considering how their particular touristic practices challenge and reformulate understandings of tourism. These patterns are established first within the second home literature, and then within studies of return home mobilities.

The growth of second homes

Second homes have a diverse material, social, and cultural history in many globally dispersed locations. In some areas second homes were present as early as the Roman Era (Dijst et al., 2005), while in others, such as North America, patterns of seasonal migration were incorporated into ancient life (Timothy, 2004, pp. 133-134). At the end of the nineteenth century, when the modern second home phenomenon became recognized, second homes were often transferred through family inheritance, and in some areas this familial chain of ownership remains an important characteristic of second homes today. At first, second homes were mainly accessible to only the uppermost socio-economic groups, due to the money needed to travel to and maintain these homes.

Though second homes were long present in certain communities, the end of World War II started a period of marked growth within second home ownership and use in areas including Canada (Priddle and Kreutzwiser, 1977, p. 165), Western Europe (Bielckus et al., 1972; Jacobs, 1972), and Australia (Selwood and Tonts, 2004).[xii] The growth was due in part to the economic boom that opened second home markets to the middle class, and it continued through the 1960s and 1970s in many areas (Coppock, 1977b; Timothy, 2004). In addition to the post-war economic boom, increases in the amount of leisure time and disposable income available to individuals, as well as the ease and availability of transportation due to access to personal vehicles, helped to facilitate growth in second homes (Hall and Müller, 2004a; Rogers, 1977; Wolfe, 1977). In the United States, a massive advertising campaign and high pressure sales tactics also played a large role in recreational property acquisition (American Society of Planning Officials, 1976, p. 37). Since the initial boom, second homes have continued to multiply, and in many countries they have become quite commonplace (American Society of Planning Officials, 1976; Bielckus, 1977; Casado-Diaz, 2004; Clout, 1977; Halseth, 2004). In 1970, Ragatz and Gelb asserted that second home ownership was "grossly underreported" (1970, p. 58),

and the continuing lack of information on second home ownership in many areas suggests that this evaluation is likely still relevant. Second homes remain important today, and with highly mobile populations of retired people and convenient international aviation, internationally located second homes are increasingly prevalent.

The prevalence and social importance of second homes has led to a significant amount of research. In academic studies, second homes have been addressed within several discernable, but overlapping, frames.[xiii] Firstly, many studies have considered second homes as a housing and land use issue. Discussions of how to track and map distributions are central, and have been complicated by the challenge of defining second homes and the lack of data on second homes. The environmental consequences of development have also been a central focus within this frame. Secondly, second-home owners have been studied as a distinct population with particular characteristics and decision-making patterns. Though some of this work is concerned with how second-home owners take part in socially significant practices, others view owners more as consumers within a particular industry. Thirdly, scholars have examined the social and relational aspects of second homes. These studies have considered the socio-cultural roots of second homes in particular mythologies, as well as issues of conflict between second-home owners and local populations. Within this portion of the literature, the mobilities connected to second homes are given little consideration. Mobility is treated as an assumed necessity for second homes, and one whose influence can be overlooked. These frames contribute insights that address policy and social concerns, but also establish a pattern of academic research that discusses second homes without problematizing their role within tourism and mobilities.

Housing and development – space as a container, space to be mapped

The first framing of second homes considers them as a particular type of housing and land use development. In popular media forms such as magazines and newspapers, the second home market and second homes as a type of development and housing are extensively treated (Ragatz and Cordell, 1980). Rather than addressing what to look for in a second home or the value of second homes as an investment, academic literature sharing this frame is concerned with the quantification and spatial distribution of second homes in relation to primary residences (Wolfe, 1951). This concern with distribution is deemed important because of its status as a prerequisite for planning and development: "It is essential for sound planning to know not only where people are listed for census counts but where they require services, consume products and so forth" (Ragatz, 1977, p. 181). Accurately locating and describing the current state of second home use is thus seen as a necessary step towards predicting its form and affect in the future.

Scholars have therefore attempted to collect information on the particular placement of second homes within particular regions. Many studies have concluded that second home are most often found in concentrated areas around major urban centers and near aesthetic amenities (Aldskogius, 1969; Coppock, 1977a; Halseth and Rosenberg, 1990; Müller, 2002; Ragatz, 1977; Rogers, 1977), though regional characteristics have a strong role in distributional differences (American Society of Planning Officials, 1976; Müller, 2006).

Today, with better roadways and transportation, there is a growth of distances between homes, and whereas second homes from decades ago were close to cities (and have now become incorporated into the suburbs of some major cities), some individuals now travel internationally to their second homes (Selwood and Tonts, 2004). Acknowledging distances, however, is not the same as acknowledging mobilities. Though the consideration of both primary and second homes in these studies suggests an implicit understanding of the mobilities connected to second homes, mapping distributions has focused more on the spatial location of second homes, while the travel links between second homes and primary ones are given limited attention.

Within this first frame of housing and land use, second homes become important as measurable, material phenomena that are necessary to consider within regional planning. Thus scholars undertake exercises in charting patterns of use, uncovering demographics of users, and identifying the environmental, social, and economic impacts of second homes, with the understanding that more information will lead to better planning and increased control over future development. Many reports take care to provide environmental and social recommendations in a format that is useable to local authorities and individual cottagers (Anonymous, 1989; Downing, 1986; Kreutzwiser and Nelson, 1975; Lee et al., 1978). They consider issues such as the carrying capacity of locations with particular aesthetic appeal (Priddle and Kreutzwiser, 1977) and the potential for second home developments to destroy the desirable characteristics that attracted development to locations in the first place (Hall and Williams, 2002a; Halseth, 2004; Selwood and Tonts, 2004). Such development-oriented studies aim to serve as barometers of the current situation and to provide interventions into future policy and development.

Throughout these studies, second homes are examined as localized physical units that are central to social policy considerations. The difficulty of defining second homes and collecting statistics on them, however, has been a significant limitation. As a result, the information available to planners is largely based on isolated case studies, and touches only briefly on the wider social and cultural implications of second homes.

The difficulty of definition

Even such elementary tasks as determining the location of second homes have been complicated by the proliferation of widely differing definitions. Not only are second homes known by many names, including recreational residences (Halseth and Rosenberg, 1990), cottages (Jarlöv, 1999; Priddle and Kreutzwiser, 1977), chalets (Gardavský, 1977), vacation homes (Ragatz, 1977; Wolfe, 1970), vacation houses (Aldskogius, 1969), holiday homes (Mottiar and Quinn, 2003), and inessential houses (Wolfe, 1965, after F. Scott Fitzgerald), but they are also defined quite differently in different countries and studies.

Second homes are often defined as sedentary, temporary residences that are not rented on a short term basis (as is the case with hotel accommodation), but are rather owned (Clout, 1977, p. 47). This definition, however, does not directly address the role of static

caravans or trailers, which can be second homes in some countries. Complications can also arise when considering what second homes are demarcated from. Distinguishing between recreational lots and second homes (American Society of Planning Officials, 1976), or between holiday homes and second homes (Mottiar and Quinn, 2003) can place different limits upon what second homes, and second home use, are. Thus, while such distinctions are necessary and useful in particular circumstances, they contribute to challenges and inconsistencies within the literature as a whole.

In addition to distinguishing second homes from other types of recreational properties, they are usually separated from primary homes, and in many cases making this distinction is very challenging. The marking of a primary home by terms such as the 'usual' residence, or the residence used 'most often' can be unclear, especially when quantitative data is desired on second home ownership or use. As Dower notes, interpretation must not become a factor, otherwise inconsistencies can arise in classification (1977). As British scholars have noted, flats that are used as residences in the city during the week can become difficult to classify as primary or second homes, and this classificatory difficulty has sometimes precluded their study (Bielckus et al., 1972, p. 9). In the context of life course mobilities, defining a primary and secondary home is very difficult (Aronsson, 2004). If, for example, an individual is highly mobile, a sheer count of days at each location may not be a good indicator of which location is a primary home. Indeed, merely counting days of residence may not be adequate unless the type of stay is considered. In his consideration of second homes, Flognfeldt recognizes that time away from the primary home falls into many categories, and thus he distinguishes between local permanent residents, weekly commuters, second-home owners, visitors to family, and occasional tourists (Flognfeldt, 2002, p. 190). Alternately, if factors such as place attachment are considered, the home resided in most often may not be the most important to residents. Increased mobilities have also opened up the possibility that individuals have multiple homes, and so the precision of marking a second home may, in some cases, be inappropriate (Williams et al., 2004, p. 112). As Ragatz and Gelb note:

> the vacation home is such a composite product. It is not only a physical shelter, but also an outdoor recreation activity, and in many cases it is a long-range investment or even a potential place for retirement. (1970, p. 58)

Definition therefore becomes an important task that is specific to each study. Though studies of second homes have often responded by choosing definitions that erase the presence of complicated forms of second homes, such as city flats and mobile caravans, such definitions represent limited and particular constructions of second homes. As this literature demonstrates, this choice overlooks, rather than engaging with, both the inherent difficulties of definition and the situation of second homes within complicated mobilities. In light of the growth of internationally situated second homes, this silence is significant.

The difficulty of compiling statistics

Studies of second homes have been challenged not only by problems of definition, but also by the lack of statistics on second home ownership and use. Many governments,

including those in England and Wales, did not track second homes in any systematic way during the major growth years (Bielckus et al., 1972), either because of the difficulty in defining second home usage, or because second homes were not seen to be an important factor within planning or tourism. Governments in many countries including Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa still fail to distinguish between primary and second homes, or to track second homes in any systematic way (Frost, 2004; Keen and Hall, 2004; Svenson, 2004; Visser, 2004). In New Zealand, for example, second homes are only recorded in the census if someone happens to occupy them on census night, and even then they are not distinguished from primary homes (Keen and Hall, 2004). The lack of even basic information on the number and location of second homes makes independent statistical gathering very challenging, especially on a large scale.

Even in countries where information is collected on second homes, problems with data can severely limit its utility. Poor distinctions between primary and secondary homes, reliance on personal characterizations of property in places where secondary homes are taxed differently, varying definitions, and limitations around naming primary homes are among the weaknesses in existing data (American Society of Planning Officials, 1976; Barke and France, 1988, p. 144; Müller, 2004). In the absence of existing listings of second home properties or owners, many academics have been forced to rely on creative means of determining second homes (Bielckus et al., 1972; Girard and Gartner, 1993; Wolfe, 1951). These methods provide some insight into second home trends, but the continuing dearth of basic information about second homes leads to many practical difficulties, including determining the provision of necessary services to various second home areas (Frost, 2004). Scarce or problematic data thus hinders both academic and policy endeavors.

The lack of statistics on second homes was recognized as an early obstacle in the literature (Coppock, 1977c), and the continuing gap in information leaves much attention devoted to attempts to describe the physical location and number of second homes in various case studies (Hall and Müller, 2004b). Though these efforts are useful, especially to those concerned with the development and planning of second home regions, they also perpetuate a discourse around second homes that does not engage with how mobilities and understandings of the touristic affect the choice and use of second homes.

Owners and decisions – space as composed of characteristics and motivations

The second frame that is found in studies of second homes concentrates on owners. In order to better understand the particularities of development in different areas, many studies have endeavored to discover more about the characteristics and motivations of second-home owners. Across regions and countries, authors have found that second-home owners are predominantly from the middle class, with the head of the household being middle-aged, and in many countries owners are also typically white with educational levels that are slightly above average for the region.

Painting an accurate picture of second-home owners is seen to be a necessary prerequisite for understanding the decision to purchase a second home in a particular region. For

example, the distribution of second homes around urban areas corresponds with owners who come from urban areas, and thus scholars have theorized that the distance between second and primary homes is a significant factor in the process of decision making (Wolfe, 1970). An early study by Aldskogius sought to examine the distribution of second homes based on the place utility and decision making of owners (1969). Further studies have considered many possible factors in the decision process (Robertson, 1977), and other motivations that affect ownership decisions include the status owners gain (Wolfe, 1965), the opportunity cottages provide for a slower-paced life (Timothy, 2004), anticipation that the second home will become a primary home upon retirement (Bielckus et al., 1972; de Vane, 1975), the desire to connect with a new place (Keen and Hall, 2004, p. 188), and the need to escape change (Jaakson, quoted in Williams, 2002, p. 357). Motivations and preferences in second homes have also varied across regions. In Britain, for example, buyers have been found to prefer properties that are barely inhabitable, because they can then undertake renovations to fit their particular needs (de Vane, 1975; Hoggart and Buller, 1995; Jacobs, 1972). Thus, as with distributions and development, the motivations behind decisions to buy second homes vary considerably based on particular geographic and social contexts.

The mythic and the conflict – space as cultural product and contested terrain

Though policy-oriented studies considering development and ownership decisions constitute a significant portion of the second home literature, there are also notable contributions that highlight a third framework: the social discourse and relationships involved in second home visits. This frame can be identified in examinations of the mythic and cultural function of second homes, as well as in studies of the conflicts and problems that can arise in relationships between second-home owners and local communities.

Second homes have a strong cultural basis within many countries. Canada, for example, has a strong culture of cottages and cottaging (Jaakson, 1986) that is connected to 'frontier myths' (Wolfe, 1977), just as in Britain there is an idealization of the perfect rural house (Hoggart and Buller, 1995). Second homes are thus central within many national cultures (Flognfeldt, 2004; Keen and Hall, 2004), and denote a particular set of ideals regarding leisure and family (Halseth, 1998). In some cases, the mythologies and spatializations of second homes are seen to help recreate a rootedness, authenticity and familial connection that is missing in modern life (Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999; Williams, 2002) . This rootedness has been addressed in studies of place attachment, and scholars such as Kaltenborn have considered how different factors contribute to the development of an attachment to and sense of place (1997).

Within cultural mythologies, second homes are spatialized in opposition to not only the city, for which they are seen to compensate (Clout, 1977, p. 57), but also the rural areas in which they reside (Halseth, 2004). As Halseth notes, the separation of second homes from rural communities is a fundamental theme of cottage folklore (1998, p. 14). This mythic separation is often mirrored by a separation of individuals within rural and second home communities, and such separations have often led to conflict.

Many studies have considered the impact of conflicts between local and second home populations. The different expectations and desires of year-round and seasonal populations have led to conflicts over things such as: the noise of helicopters and bird-scarers that are used in agriculture (Hall and Johnson, in Hall and Williams, 2002a, p. 35), the distribution of infrastructure costs (Albarre, 1977, p. 140), the scope of new development (Gartner, 1987; Girard and Gartner, 1993; Halseth, 1998; Jaakson, 1986) and the competition for second homes that is seen to contribute to rising property prices which locals are unable to match (Coppock, 1977b, p. 147). In many cases, second homes and their higher class owners have been found to serve as scapegoats for other problems plaguing rural communities (Coppock, 1977b; Dower, 1977; Gallent et al., 2003; Hoggart and Buller, 1995). Though differences in the socio-economic status of locals and second-home owners have not been a problem in some locations (Jacobs, 1972, pp. 36-40), in others researchers have addressed the social conflicts and exclusionary spaces that socio-economic gaps fuel (Halseth, 2004; Hoogendoorn et al., 2005; Müller et al., 2004). Second home ownership opened up to the middle classes in many countries during the post-war boom, but in recent years competition has driven up prices in some areas, making second homes once again available to only more elite and wealthy members of society (Halseth, 2004). As a result, the possibility for differential expectations, opinions and resources continues to foster conflicts between local and second home populations.

As these three loose frameworks illustrate, the bulk of existing literature on second homes does not take pains to theoretically engage with the importance of mobility to understandings of second homes.[xiv] Most policy-oriented studies either address mobility only as a displacement measurable in kilometers, or ignore it entirely. Mobility thus becomes either quantified as a measurable displacement from the city to the second home, making the latter a static point that is qualified by a particular distance, or it is ignored entirely. Research into the social and cultural aspects of second homes contributes significant insights, and those concerning the spatialization of second home myths will be of particular importance to this study, however this research still fails to investigate the affect that theorizing mobilities has upon second homes.[xv]

Despite the presence of implicit assumptions about mobility within all studies of second homes, the issues of mobility and tourism, which are central to this study, are only addressed at length in a small section of literature. This existing work is instructive, but limiting, as many authors fail to fully enunciate the relationship between second homes and tourism, and those who do often come to contradictory conclusions.

Second homes as spaces of tourism and mobility

As the previous section has demonstrated, technical and policy-oriented projects have been prime concerns in the significant collection of work that deals with second homes, and limited attention has been devoted to the issues of tourism and mobility that concern this project. Though a sub-section of second home literature has begun in recent years to investigate the connection between second homes and tourism, this work has often either assumed poorly defined connections to tourism or debated whether second homes fit

within varying conceptions of tourism, rather than asking, as this study does, what tourism could look like in light of second home experiences.

The concept of tourism has appeared in studies of second homes dating back to the first wave of academic study in the 1970s, but it has often remained taken-for-granted and poorly defined. In early work, Dower highlights how different issues come to light if second homes are considered as housing, or alternately as tourism (1977, p. 157). Choosing a frame of second home tourism, he notes that this form of tourism has an advantage over others in that it brings a seasonal, but more sustained economic impact to receiving regions. Other work during this period similarly takes the existence of second home tourism for granted, in order to examine its positive economic affect. Second-home owners often pay more in taxes than they use in local services, and make additional purchases within second home regions that contribute positively to the economy (Coppock, 1977b). Though second home visitors may not consume as heavily as more temporary tourists, their extended stays and repeated visits can make up for this difference (Henshall, 1977). Additionally, the positive economic return of second home tourism is maintained over time without any external marketing or encouragement (Dower, 1977, p. 157). Second homes considered as repetitive tourism have thus brought a unique perspective to examinations of the contributions of second homes to surrounding economies.

Second homes also have a notable position within economic analyses of the leisure and tourism sector. They occupy a crucial place within domestic tourism, taking a significant share of domestic tourism nights in Australia and New Zealand (Frost, 2004; Keen and Hall, 2004). In Norway, second homes comprised the accommodation for almost half of all vacations within the country in the early 1990s (Flognfeldt, 2002, pp. 189-190). Despite the value of these studies, their apparently unproblematic acceptance of second homes as tourism has become a point of contention. Some authors suggest that the lack of data on second homes is connected to a feeling that they do not fit within the tourism industry (Frost, 2004). Indeed, industry-oriented examinations of tourism both exclude and include second home visits, demonstrating the lack of consensus on this point.

In many cases, the inclusion or exclusion of second homes from study seems to depend on how one defines second home tourism. Unfortunately, many studies have used a conception of 'tourism' that is poorly outlined. In Hall and Müller's collection, tourism and second homes are often spoken of in tandem, however what 'tourism' is within this context is not well developed (2004b). Tourism can be considered as an economic industry, as a social and cultural interaction, as a performed role, or as an activity guided by particular motivations. In each case, juxtaposing tourism and second homes comes to mean something different. A lack of consistency in definitions of tourism certainly affects discussions of whether second home practices involve tourism.

Where second home usage is broken up into several types that range from personal use on weekends by non-paying guests to investment properties that are run by a management group and visited rarely, tourism can be seen to easily fit the visits of non-owners. Hoogendoorn et al., for example, find that one of their case studies in South

Africa is a very striking example of tourism because the second home development in De Waterkant has owners who rarely visit, and it is managed in their absence by a company that rents the properties out as holiday accommodation (2005). In addition to this extreme type of second home tourism, involving the tourism of visitors rather than owners, second-home owners can also facilitate tourism by hosting non-paying guests on Visiting Friends and Relatives (VFR) tourism trips. Surveys have noted that hosting VFR is common among second-home owners (Jacobs, 1972), and this type of activity can become challenging when visitors expect to be entertained by their hosts at all times (O'Reilly, 2003). In this case, second-home owners can become unpaid tourist guides for friends and relatives who have come to visit.

Though non-owners can often be easily identified as tourists at second homes, the visits of second-home owners have been more problematic to classify. Indeed, though many scholars have considered this question, their conclusions have been quite diverse. Some prefer to call second home visits a type of 'domestic tourism' (Frost, 2004; Girard and Gartner, 1993; Keen and Hall, 2004), without fully addressing the implications of what tourism means in this context. Others have been careful to distinguish between tourists and second home residents. Svenson, for example, distinguishes between tourists and cottagers based on the lack of commitment the former has to the communities encountered (2004, p. 73). Similarly, Aronsson makes a distinction between tourists, vacation residents, and permanent residents, though he recognizes the boundaries of these categories to be potentially contentious (2004). Eric Cohen places second home visits within the category of 'marginal tourism', because they are recurrent, and Müller agrees with the label, noting that second home visits involve a shorter travel distance (Cohen, 1974; Müller, 2006). These conclusions about the separation between second homes and tourism, however, often rest upon tenuous qualifications.

For O'Reilly, second home trips are not tourism, because not only do second-home owners not identify with the label of 'tourist', but the purpose of their mobility is not to undertake tourism (2003). Yet, in her discussion, O'Reilly refers to second-home owners as 'residential tourists' and deems second home areas 'tourist space'. She also concludes the discussion of her findings by asking if a couple who practice both everyday and tourist activities in Spain are tourists or migrants. Her paper argues that they are migrants, but her concluding question opens space to consider them as tourists. It is thus obvious that altering her definition of tourism to one not based on the motivation or purpose for trips could easily rearrange the classification of her observations.

Though many studies have been careful to articulate separations between second-home owners and tourists, the arguments used to uphold this distinction can be debated. Considerations of how tourists can be committed to preserving communities through ecotourism, how individuals can easily transition between being tourists and vacation residents, and how second homes can be located internationally all challenge the boundaries between tourists and second home residents. Additionally, though the equation of home with work and tourism with leisure is commonplace, in light of the complex work and leisure mobilities practiced today, we can no longer dismiss the touristic possibilities of second homes because of their relationship to jobs such as home

maintenance. Just as business trips can include moments of tourism, so tourism trips can included moments of work, and thus this reason to exclude second homes from tourism must be rejected.

This study builds from the work of those who have strongly supported the notion of second home users as tourists. Jaakson, for one, argues against Cohen's insistence that second home tourism is 'marginal', showing that locals recognize second-home owners as tourists in many instances, because they always come to second home areas from elsewhere (1986, p. 386). Stipulations that recurrent visits are not entirely touristic (Cohen, 1974) fail to recognize the ways in which even classic cases of tourism, such as winter trips to a resort in Hawaii, can be yearly, habitual, events. Thus I agree with Jaakson in his assertion that repetition does not mean the absence of novelty: "No activity can be classified *a priori* as not being able to potentially provide novelty and discovery, even after repetition" (1986, p. 374). Quinn and Turley, after reviewing these debates over second homes and tourism, also conclude that second-home owners are indeed tourists (2005). In this view, visiting a familiar location does not determine the type of interactions that will occur there, and thus familiar locations should not be excluded from considerations of the touristic.

In addition to assuming the status of second home visitors as tourists, this study argues for the importance of mobilities to understandings of second homes and tourism. A recent collection by Hall and Müller embraces second homes within a consideration of tourism and mobility. This work shares many of the concerns outlined here regarding the absence of insights from transnationalism and complex conceptions of home in studies of tourism (2004b). These shared concerns, however, do not prevent many of the contributing authors from considering only the role of second homes within tourism, that is, accepting second homes as a type of previously defined tourism. This study attempts to engage with theorizations of tourism so that second homes are not considered merely as another niche within tourism, but alternately as a case that can be instructive in re-conceptualizing our treatment of tourism as a whole. Svenson, Aronsson and Duval address some of the issues that are applicable in such a re-theorizing of tourism and mobility (Aronsson, 2004; Duval, 2004a; Svenson, 2004) and this study continues to examine second home mobilities in a similar vein.

A final small section of the second home literature has begun to engage with mobility through a consideration of the interrelation of second homes, tourism, and migration. In some ways, this fit has been difficult. As Visser notes, "the linking of these traditionally unrelated fields of interest has portrayed second home development as a form of both migration and tourism, which defies many of the categorisations and descriptions of either tradition individually" (2004, p. 196). There are, however, productive insights from negotiating this intersection, including the ability to consider second homes as a type of consumption-led migration having particular traits when viewed alongside other types of travel (Hall and Williams, 2002b; Williams and Hall, 2000).

As well, considering migration helps to draw attention to the particularities of second home mobilities. In her study of Spanish second homes, Casado-Diaz highlights the

differences between Spanish second-home owners and foreign second-home owners by suggesting the former 'circulate', whereas the latter are better described as 'seasonal migrants' who visit fewer times, but for longer durations (2004, p. 232). Such distinctions within populations of second-home owners are important steps towards further characterizing the relationship between second homes and tourism. Though recent collections have begun to draw important insights from the consideration of second homes in relation to tourism and migration (Hall and Williams, 2002b; Hall and Müller, 2004b; Williams and Hall, 2000), this connection remains underdeveloped.

As this survey has shown, the existing literature on second homes fails to address the important impact of wider mobilities upon experiences at second homes. It has also incompletely addressed how second homes are not only a site in which tourism occurs, but also a case that can transform our understandings of tourism. This study thus endeavors to build upon work that affirms the touristic potential within second homes, along with the connection between second homes, mobility, and migration, in order to show how second home mobilities are not just simple displacements, but rather contain rich touristic engagements with space and place.

Return home mobilities within return migrations

Unlike second home mobilities, return home mobilities have never been identifiable as a particular capitalistic phenomenon. That is, they do not involve the purchase of a property, and the economic transactions involved in return home mobilities can be hidden amongst everyday or touristic ones. As a result, return home mobilities have been treated very differently from second home mobilities, with very little work considering them as part of an identifiable industry or consumption practice. Rather, most studies consider return home mobilities in conjunction with return migration and transnationalism. Though this approach leads to a significant focus upon mobility, it also maintains a connection between return home mobility and wider patterns of migration that eclipses the importance of return home trips as opportunities for tourism.

The phenomenon of individuals returning to previous homes, either for short visits or repatriation, has received little academic attention. In one of several recent collections considering return migration, King remarks that "return migration is the great unwritten chapter in the history of migration" (2000, p. 7). Studies of migration have considered it only within a particular timeline and direction – that is, as the departure from one place and arrival at another, where a new life will begin (King, 2000, p. 7). Within this framework, returning is not a part of unidirectional migration movement, and has thus often been ignored as a possibility. This ignorance is not only due to understandings of migration as unidirectional, but also in some cases because of cultural myths that mark places such as the United States as filled with utopian opportunities for migrants, who never want to leave (King, 2000). Repatriation and temporary returns or visits have therefore not received much analysis (Oxfeld, 2001, p. 181). Those who have now begun to examine return migration are lengthening the temporal scope of migration mobilities, in order to consider multiple trips that occur during individuals' lifetimes. Shifting frames

in this way acknowledges the continuing role of previous homes and relationships in migrants' lives.[xvi]

The emerging literature on return migration encounters many of the complications of definition that plague studies of second home mobilities. Firstly, differing definitions of who qualifies as a return migrant are rampant. Return migration is generally understood to involve migration from a location, which may then be visited during trips from the new home, and which later becomes a permanent home again. Hall and Williams emphasize the importance of subsequent stages of mobility by setting return migration within a categorization of stages of tourism and migration flows (2002a). Different countries define return migrants, however, according to unique temporal qualifications, such having been gone for a year and intending to stay for at least a year, and as a result, countries can come up with widely differing measurements:

> Even where the same flow was being measured, the data seldom matched - as with the Italian return flow from West Germany during the 1960s, three times larger, according to the German statistics on exists, than the entry data for Italy. (King, 2000, p. 9)

These differing definitions become intertwined with a lack of data and, as a result, many countries have poor records on the numbers of returning citizens within their borders (Ghosh, 2000, p. 46), as well as the number of citizens residing outside their borders. Like second home mobilities, return migrations are therefore poorly understood at even a basic quantitative level.

Studies have attempted to provide insight into the characteristics and motivations of individuals who undertake return migration. Demographic information has been considered within particular studies of return migrants in order to better understand those groups that are perhaps more likely to return to particular societies (Ghosh, 2000; St. Bernard, 2005). The Caribbean has been one area receiving a great deal of attention, and scholars have found returnees are drawn more by 'pull' factors than by 'push' factors in their decision to return (Potter, 2005a). While many migrate originally in order to pursue labour opportunities, their return is more often related to a connection to places of home (Conway et al., 2005). In many cases, the decision to return may result from a change in sentiment, and even those who migrated with intentions of permanent residence in another country may find they are later considering return migration (Hall and Williams, 2002a, p. 32). In this way, the motivations that affect migration and return migration can be seen to change over time.

Though some decisions to become a returning migrant are not pre-planned, the existence of a return ideology in areas such as the Caribbean can contribute to a longstanding connection between migrations and return migration. Within Caribbean culture, migration has long been viewed as an opportunity for individuals to gain the entrepreneurial and social capital that is necessary for their success.[xvii] As Olwig notes, the history of slavery within the Caribbean led to post-emancipation situations that did not provide many opportunities for newly freed individuals (1997). Without many other options, migration became an attractive opportunity: "It was perceived as a temporary relocation which would enable [the emancipated] to return with the necessary resources

to establish an economically independent life on land of their own" (Olwig, 1997, p. 21). Thus, on many Caribbean islands, migration "is considered less as a survival decision and more as a strategy for individual, family and national advancement" (Rodman and Conway, 2005, p. 106). Though not all migrants from Caribbean countries have returned, and thus fulfilled the intent of this ideology, dreams and intentions of return still commonly frame initial migrations.

Return visits, returning home

If migrants intend to become return migrants at some point, then return visits can be seen as an institutionalized step towards this eventual migration. In other societies without a clear return ideology, return visits take on other forms. Return home visits have been understood as transnational exercises, as a means to track change, as homogeneous, as complicated by obligation, and as important for maintaining kinship ties. These frames provide relevant insights for understanding return mobilities, but are often rooted within assumptions of eventual return migration, thus overlooking the possibility that transnational practices and touristic practices overlap.

As second home users are heterogeneous, so too are return home visitors. They have been categorized based on demographics and their orientation to return travel (Nguyen, Waryszak and King, in Nguyen and King, 2002, p. 229), as well as based on the characteristics of their return visits. By distinguishing between occasional, seasonal, temporary, and permanent returns, King uses the temporal span of visits, as well as their relationship to leisure or work, to distinguish between motivations (2000, pp. 10-11). Depending on the circumstances in which return home visits are understood to occur, they reveal many different qualities.

For many authors, return home visits have a primarily social function. Recognizing the connection that is maintained between individuals, even after migration, return home visits become important as a way of reconnecting with family and friends who have been left behind. Return home visits then become a repetitive 'transnational exercise', which helps to maintain social relationships and cultural ties to former homes (Duval, 2004b, 2005). Transnationalism is a term that was coined in the 1970s to address the social institutions and interactions that transcend geographic state boundaries (Levitt and Waters, 2002). The recognition that migration did not mean simply the exchange of one home for another prompted investigation into the network of interactions and structures that shape the experiences of migrants. As a result, the nature of home has already been contested within examinations of transnationalism, and understandings of community and culture have been separated from geographic territory (Ahmed et al., 2003; De Souza, 2005). Transnational culture, then, spans different geographic locations, and involves unique interactions of which return visits are a crucial part. For migrant Vietnamese populations, return visits are a vital part of maintaining kinship ties, in part because of the importance of sharing in family rituals at ancestral graves (Long, 2004). The return visit is a necessary mobility strategy that connects multiple homes and reinforces transnational connections. "Seen this way, the return visit represents the physical connection between, in some cases, the diaspora and the external homeland, while transnationalism as a

conceptual framework can be used as an explanatory framework that highlights such connections as socially meaningful exercises" (Duval, 2004b, p. 54). Mobility and the physical practice of visiting solidify the social connections already existing across space.

Return home visits are also seen as an opportunity for migrants to keep track of changes within their former homes, and to re-connect with the places of importance to them. Duval notes that despite improvements in communications technology, physical return is still seen as the best way in which to keep track of the changes in one's homeland (Duval, 2005, p. 255). Returnees to Vietnam have spoken of the desire to reconnect with space and relocate places on their return:

> Memories of former houses, streets, fields, and trees became specific experiences with normal dimensions again. Certain smells were associated with a specific fruit. Space being relocated in place was not just a set of distant images, stories, or disembodied voices but encompassed specific sensory experiences, histories and relationships. (Long, 2004, p. 88)

Returning thus allows migrants a chance to reconnect with the particularities of spaces and places of importance to them.

In some countries, return visits are also tied up within complicated networks of obligation. The role of return visits in maintaining transnational social ties can be seen to distinguish it from other forms of VFR tourism (Duval, 2004b, p. 52), and the obligation involved in some of these returns further distances 'transnational exercises' from a sense of freedom and personal choice. Scholars examining the return migration of individuals from countries with strong traditions of Confucianism have observed that the responsibilities of children to their parents and families that are outlined in Confucian precepts make return an obligation (Nguyen and King, 2002, 2004). Within the concept of 'filial piety', children are obligated not only to their living family, but also to their ancestors, and their responsibilities include paying respect at ancestral gravesites. Exercising filial piety then can be both a motivation and obligation for return visits (Lew and Wong, 2004). As Nguyen and King note, this obligation to travel has not often been considered in work on diasporas and tourism, and points to a Eurocentric understanding of travel (2004). Though Caribbean migrants do not have a Confucian background, the return mythology and a strong sense of family can similarly motivate connections with home, and leave migrants neither entirely independent, nor obligated, in their return trips.

As well as the obligation to return, migrants can face obligations concerning their activities upon return. Lew and Wong highlight how initial return visits bring with them elaborate expectations including giving red pockets, making offerings at grave visits, hosting large meals and having dancers and firecrackers (2004). While some events highlight the importance of participation in family rituals, others represent the obligation returnees have to make financial contributions to their family and the wider community. Remittances have become a central part of the economy of many Chinese communities, and major building projects have in many cases been funded entirely by overseas migrants. Villagers in some areas have organized into committees that solicit funding for major projects from overseas migrants (Oxfeld, 2004, p. 95). Such donations are understood to be representative of individuals' connection to their ancestral land, as well

as being necessary to maintain their pride and 'face' in Chinese culture (Oxfeld, 2004, pp. 95-96). Thus, in addition to obligations to financially support close relatives, returning migrants can find themselves under pressure to donate to projects that benefit their homeland communities more widely. Though some are happy to make such contributions, the expectation to do so can also be problematic.

Return visits are also opportunities for local communities to evaluate the changes returning migrants have undergone, and as such they are crucial points in these social relations (Nguyen and King, 2004). When migrancy is initiated as a way of obtaining greater economic success, positive change can be seen in financial terms, and the pressure to donate money becomes still greater. In this way, the diverse expectations of returning migrants can compete with the desires of other groups and make visits as uncomfortable as they are joyous (cf. Oxfeld, 2001).

These insights illuminate the role of return visits within transnational communities and possible return migrations. By treating supra-national communities and experiences of return migration as everyday occurrences, such studies help to emphasize the banality and regularity of migrations and mobilities. This shift is significant because "circulation no longer represents an interruption of ordinary, settled life, but constitutes a normal condition for many people" (Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999, p. 227). Within many communities of Canadian immigrants, return visits and return migration are frequent occurrences. Hiebert and Ley's study of immigrants in Vancouver notes that despite significant differences in the transnational ties and mobilities of interviewees, about two-thirds undertake return trips to previous homes (2006). Many of the immigrants from Hong Kong studied in Preston et al.'s Canadian study also make return trips and remain involved with associations and organizations in Hong Kong (2006, pp. 100-101). The threat of removal that hangs over some immigrants or refugees also marks the normalization of mobility within certain populations (Burman, 2006a). This literature is thus invaluable in drawing attention to the ways in which mobilities are an integral part of everyday lives.

Despite beneficially highlighting mobility, return visit and return migration literature has limitations. Studies of return migration in the Caribbean, such as those in Potter et al.'s collection (2005), consider immigration, return trips, and return migration as possible stages within life mobilities, and thus center their efforts on placing experiences in all spaces within sequential patterns of departure and return. This frame is important for understanding the factors contributing to return migration, but eclipses other important influences upon the understanding of home places and the experience of return home mobilities. Similarly, many studies, including Duval's work on Caribbean migrants residing in Toronto (2005), remain directed towards a consideration of return trips as upholding the fabric of transnational communities. Again, this perspective contributes considerable insight to studies of transnationalism, but fails to make connections between these mobilities and other social issues. Therefore, though the attention to mobility within this literature provides useful insights for this study, there is an inattention to the touristic possibilities that exist alongside transnational engagements within experiences of return.

Return and tourism

Some studies have considered the touristic elements within return home mobilities, but as in the case of second home mobilities, they treat return home visits as marginal engagements with tourism without considering how these visits demand new understandings of tourism. This oversight is seen in discussions that place transnational engagement alongside tourism.

In some cases, return home trips are connected to both transnationalism and tourism, but a separation is maintained between the two. Experiences of return can involve practices such as pilgrimages to ancestral sites or other landmarks that resemble forms of VFR or ancestral heritage tourism. Where there is a personal connection to these attractions, visits can involve both transnational and touristic elements. Holsey discusses the case of return trips to slave castles in Africa, and remarks upon these trips as being both connected to diasporic identities as well as tourism infrastructures (2004). Others, however, wish to retain the unique status of transnational relationships, and thus make distinctions between return visits and other types of tourism they can resemble. Duval, discussing the work of Baldassar, suggests that return visits are separated from VFR tourism because they involve particular social and cultural ties to the destination (2002). Kibria similarly distinguishes between trips associated with transnationalism and voluntary 'homeland trips' to countries of ancestral heritage (2002). These distinctions become confusing, however, because such social ties are not independent of tourism. Larsen et al. have recently argued that VFR involves significant social obligations in addition to place-based tourism activities (2006). Second- or third-generation migrants can also return to visit friends and relatives in locations where they did not live, but nonetheless have cultural ties. Thus, this study suggests that mobilities can simultaneously involve transnational ties and touristic practices.

This co-mingling of transnational and touristic practices is accompanied by unique negotiations of local and tourist roles. In a study in the Caribbean, Potter notes that return migrants from England find themselves in the strange position of being both within and outside of the Caribbean society. Having English accents allows these individuals to appear to others, and to be treated by others, as simultaneously locals and tourists, "both black and symbolically white, advantaged and disadvantaged" (Potter, 2005b, p. 63). Not only do people treat return migrants in divergent ways, but the roles migrants imagine themselves in can also be different from the roles others attribute to them. Moroccans who make return visits after having migrated to Israel, for example, act based on their memories of the country, and will haggle for the prices they recall from when they lived there (Levy, 2004, p. 99). Their efforts, however, are fruitless because they are not recognized as locals: "On the rare occasions that they used Maghrebi-Arabic and gestures appropriately, they still did not succeed since the merchants recognized and treated them as tourists" (Levy, 2004, p. 99). While socially and culturally connected to these areas, returning visitors can still find themselves recognized as outsiders.

Finally, studies have recognized the connection between migration and subsequent tourism. Hall and Williams outline the connections between migration and VFR tourism,

illustrating how migration creates interpersonal networks that can facilitate tourism (2002a, pp. 38-39). In this way, the migration of individuals is seen to generate tourism flows, and VFR tourism flows appear when these migrants return to their former home or friends and family from their previous home visit the migrants at their new residence (Hall and Williams, 2002a, pp. 9, 11). Such interconnections are valuable tools for understanding the relationship between multiple spaces in travel mobilities. Though this framework helps to characterize the interconnections between flows of travel, it does not answer important questions about how such flows impact the form of tourism practiced. That is, charting this connection between migration and later VFR tourism is useful, but it must be accompanied by a reconsideration of how tourism to visit friends and relatives resembles, or differs from, other types of tourism. Furthermore, it retains a focus that highlights the relationship between two homes – in this case a current and former home, or a current home and a friend or relative's home. This work continues to look for tourism in the usual spaces.

As this overview highlights, the relationships between tourism and migration has been inadequately examined within cases of return home mobility. There is an interaction between tourism and migration, especially in cases of mobilities that lie between the extremes of permanent migration and tourism, but this relationship has not been adequately addressed in tourism studies (Bell and Ward, 2000) or migration studies (Hall and Williams, 2002a). This study thus engages with return home mobilities as a site in which to find possibilities for new understandings of tourism. Some work on transnationalism has already begun to consider the geographically dispersed and contingent nature of homes and cultural relations, and in this regard it has the potential to share considerable insights with work on tourism (Coles et al., 2005). The emphasis transnationalism puts on multiple locations as necessary sites of analysis, for example, is echoed in the findings of this study and should be productively appropriated by future studies of tourism.[xviii]

Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that the literature on second home and return home visits has limited relevance for the consideration of tourism and mobility in this study. Second home literature has often failed to theorize the impact of mobility and tourism, framing studies rather within the context of industrial structures, economic transactions, and local communities. As a result, mobility has primarily surfaced as a quantifiable geographic displacement, and the label of tourism has received limited debate and widely differing applications. Return home literature is preoccupied by the framework of transnationalism and return migration, and as a result has provided significant insights about return mobilities. In doing so, however, it has maintained a focus that excludes many considerations of touristic practices. In both sets of literature, understandings of tourism appear to precede considerations of second home and return home mobilities, leaving no space to consider how these mobile cases can spark new understandings of tourism.

This study therefore proceeds from an understanding of both second home and return home mobilities as potentially touristic. Considering the complexity of work and leisure

mobilities practiced today, previous limitations placed on the possible spaces of tourism must be reexamined, and as a result, this study starts from an assumption that second home and return home mobilities can bring insights to the interaction of tourism and mobility. By taking these cases as potentially transformative for understandings of tourism, insights will be provided to help consider provocative questions such as whether migrants can be second home tourists too (Duval, 2004a, p. 90).

Chapter Three – New faces of the touristic

The cases of second home and return home mobilities in this study shed light upon new formations and characterizations of the touristic. This chapter argues for the expansion of notions of tourism to include new understandings of touristic change, new possibilities to recognize touristic practices, new types of touristic infrastructure, and new mobilities of tourism between homes. Dislodging tourism from a determinate relationship with home opens up space for the touristic to be understood as change not only between spaces, but also within spaces. Moving from a focus upon primary homes as referents for measurements of change, the notion of transit highlights how mobilities introduce change between spaces that are not fundamentally different, but rather the same. Memoir authors do not themselves hold this view, rather constructing distinctions between themselves and other tourists, but their narratives can nonetheless be seen to engage with touristic manifestations of change. In this context, touristic practices are shown to come in various forms, which are similar to and different from those highlighted in previous studies of tourism, and to be supported not only by material infrastructure, but also by spatializations and intangible structures.

Change between spaces, change within spaces

Tourism has long been characterized as an engagement with change. While some scholars have chosen to evaluate the specific form of this change, such as in MacCannell's assertion that tourists seek authenticity (1976), others have argued that new patterns of tourism necessitate a more open concept that holds tourism to be an engagement with change or novelty in the modern world (Franklin, 2003). As outlined in the introduction, understandings of tourism have often been enclosed within prescribed journeys to acceptable tourist spaces, and thus understandings of touristic change have been implicitly formulated as change between the spaces of home and tourism. The practices, spaces, and places of second home and return home mobilities in this study, however, suggest that the touristic component of these mobilities is not well captured by the notion of change between spaces.

These return home and second home mobilities show remarkable flexibility in points of reference for the touristic, and demonstrate that change need not be tied to only one referent. The traditional circular pattern of displacement between a home and a tourist space highlighted in the first chapter is teleological and goal-oriented and thus emphasizes the change that occurs between spaces. In this situation, the spaces involved are unequal, with one functioning as the predominant referent and the other as the exceptional space that is used to mark change from the first. Second home and return home mobilities, however, demonstrate other significant manifestations of change that do not rely on this unequal duality of spaces. Spaces that are familiar to individuals by virtue of close proximity or repeated visits do not preclude interactions with change and novelty, because recurrent trips and experiences of change and novelty are not mutually exclusive. As a result, touristic change in this study is notable not only between spaces, but also within spaces. Change is manifest in mobility and then incorporated into the experiences of many spaces.

This notion of change within spaces seeks to open up considerations of tourism in a similar way as Perniola's work on transit seeks to facilitate non-teleological understandings of eroticism. Transit, for Perniola, is ""a movement from the same to the same," where, however, by "same" is not meant "equal," because it entails the introduction of a difference, of a change, which the deeper it is the less striking it is" (2001, pp. 47-48). This notion of transit is necessary because it eliminates a focus on goals, and by so doing allows for a consideration of the way things can be linked in a non-hierarchical way. In this study, the nature of authors' interactions with space and place necessitate a consideration of tourism as occurring not only in the spaces that are deemed the goal of tourist trips, such as iconic tourist destinations, but in all spaces, which are on some level the same. Different homes and spatial nodes within people's mobilities thus must be treated as the same, without being seen as equal. Perniola's formulation of transit "displaces difference everywhere" (Verdicchio in Perniola, 2001, p. 31), and by so doing allows a consideration of all spaces as the same. Tourism can therefore exist in familiar and home spaces just as it can in any other ones.

Change then is not something to be measured between spaces that are a priori unequal or different, but rather is introduced with mobility or transit, and then is incorporated into experiences of similar spaces. By leveling out the treatment of all spaces, there is no automatic referent for determinations of change, and change can be recognized as occurring in the transition between different spaces, or in temporally dispersed experiences in the same space.

In this usage, change is more flexible but still fundamentally relational because it involves placing things in comparison. Change does not, however, remain something that is permanent or that exists outside of experience. It rather becomes introduced through transit and then is incorporated into experiences and constructions of particular places as compared to and marked off from other places. When I speak of changes within space then, it should be understood as changes introduced through transit and mobility that are then incorporated and re-worked into new versions of a familiar place. Individuals often refer to changes in space, but this framework acknowledges that such observed changes are not just a function of the space, but also the mobility – that is, it is the mobility away from a cottage to a primary home and back again that allows one to recognize that the cottage landscape is not exactly as it was previously. Mobility introduces room in which to consider changes between and within spaces.

When considering touristic change then, distance and home criteria need no longer apply. Though at one time greater distances were connected with greater changes in experience, the time-space compression of today's world, and the global economy that brings diverse collections of goods from all over the world to our doorsteps, have begun to discredit this argument. As Franklin argues, a change in modernity affects our perceptions of novelty and change, and demands a consideration of tourism of the everyday (2003).[xix] The 'everyday' elements of return home and second home mobilities thus make them prime sites in which to consider touristic changes within space.

Changes that are introduced and incorporated within experiences of one space can be very appealing, and undoubtedly contribute to the intrigue of some attractions, such as Old Faithful in Yellowstone National Park. Especially in cases where individuals return home after a long absence, changes within one space can be a strong motivator for travel much in the way that change between spaces is for other travellers.

For authors of return home memoirs, noting changes within the spaces of former homes is of central importance. Chiang, Phillips, and Blaise and Mukherjee all engage with historical changes that occur during their absence from their former dwelling spaces. In Phillips' memoir, she traces the many decades that span her experiences of China (1990). Born in Hong Kong, Phillips migrated to Canada at an early age, only to return to teach in Southern China as a young woman. She later moved to teach in Hong Kong, but at the outbreak of World War II found herself on vacation in Canada, unable to return. Thus she lives for several decades in Canada before being able to return again to China. At this point in her story, Phillips tells of the opening up of China to wider tourist travel, and of how she organized and guided several trips return trips, on which students and friends accompanied her. During one of these trips, Phillips makes a comment about the different experiences she and her friends are having:

> I kept saying to my group, "You hear the songs and listen to the words, but I see the changes. I simply can't believe what they have done in twenty-five years." (Phillips, 1990, p. 111)

The changes she sees within the space are highlighted as being very different from the changes her friends note between spaces. This difference is attributable to their different experiences of mobility between the two spaces. Having a previous connection to China, Phillips must integrate the changes of her transit into her pre-existing notion of place, whereas her friends are experiencing and creating a place of China for the first time. Similarly, Chiang notes the importance of comparisons to his experience of return:

> My thirty years of life in China before 1933 as well as my personal experiences as the head civil servant of three big counties put me into a rather different category as a visitor to the present-day China. I would undoubtedly compare what I could see now in China with what I knew of her before 1933. This would be inevitable (Chiang, 1977, p. 54)

After having lived in England and the United States for many years, unable to return because of political clashes and immigration policies, Chiang is finally able to return to China, and he recognizes how important comparisons between and within spaces of his experience will be to his trip.

Interpreting and interacting with these changes within space lead both Chiang and Phillips to contribute to and reinforce ideologies of progress within China.[xx] Though Phillips' assessments of change are somewhat cautious, in that she recognizes dissent and presents differing assessments of the state of the country, Chiang's are largely without qualification, and both authors end up constructing a discourse of predominantly positive historical progress in China.

Mukherjee, on the other hand, engages with disappointment upon her return to India.[xxi] After being there for some time, she becomes suspicious and contemptuous of the

strangers and tourists she observes, including her own husband (who also has an out-of-place white face). After spending a year in India, she is disenchanted with having re-encountered spaces and places that do not live up to her memories (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, pp. 220, 284-225). In her case, some of the changes she must incorporate within her experiences of this space are not deemed comfortable or desirable.

Negotiating change is thus very important, even when traveling to well-known spaces and former homes. Though such trips are qualitatively different from those to never-before-experienced locales, both interact with change. This change is an attribute of touristic experience, whether it is understood as occurring between multiple spaces or within places and spaces.

Change is also a valued and sought-after characteristic of second home mobilities. Indeed, the change a cottage or second home provides from the primary home is central to its identity and appeal (Jaakson, 1986; Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999). Life at the cottage is different because work is no longer privileged, and thus cottages become intertwined with leisure (Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999, pp. 221-222). The space of the cottage is thus spatialized as a space that involves change, in that it is spatialized in opposition to primary homes located in cities.

Observing change is also an important practice at second home cottages. After absences from the cottage, both Gordon and MacGregor highlight the importance of noticing changes in the landscape around the second home, whether they are deemed good or bad (Gordon, 2006, p. 8; MacGregor, 2002). Their recurrent trips are thus shown to have no necessary relationship to diminishing novelty. As MacGregor notes: "We will take the same route that this particular family has taken now for more than a quarter of a century – and yet we will still notice flowering dogwood and pin cherry as if never before having seen such marvels" (2005, p. 3). Regardless of multiple returns and a familiarity with this space, novelty remains:

> *Everything is new again*. New in the late 1960s, when this place was built by those who are no longer here; new in the late 1970s, when the first of the grandchildren arrived; new in the 1980s, when we began taking over; new in the 1990s; new still in the 21st century. Reborn every spring – no matter how bad the bugs. (MacGregor, 2005, p. 6, emphasis original)

This novelty doesn't cease after arriving at the cottage. MacGregor's text lauds the continuing opportunities to observe changes within the space of the cottage. Winter allows him an opportunity to eagerly gaze upon new additions to local cottages (MacGregor, 2002, p. 189), and he continually presents cottage stories that involve unique encounters with nature, such as an evening spent by the campfire with an unusually tame fox (MacGregor, 2002, pp. 82-83), and a day spent discovering and rescuing suckers stuck in the dam (MacGregor, 2002, p. 254). Just as camping or adventure trips can be attractive because of the opportunity to experience unique natural events, so too can second home mobilities, and these novelties open up space for understanding time in nature as touristic.

These cases of touristic change within spaces demonstrate the need to make a demarcation between repetitive mobilities and repetition of experience. Repetitive mobilities do not guarantee that the experiences and practices in those mobilities will be qualitatively the same. As Perniola might argue, the transit is necessarily tied to change. Therefore, novelty and change can remain important motivators and goals for even repetitive mobilities. Rather than naming a change between locations as a necessary prerequisite for tourism then, the change of locations over time can be a site for tourism. Phillips, Chiang, and Mukherjee all undertake tourism that engages with changing locations over time. In this way, change is attached to mobility and can be integrated into comparisons between spaces or between different experiences of the same space. Therefore, the possibilities for touristic practices exist anywhere.

Having thus outlined a new framework for considering touristic change, the next section shares insights from the memoirs of this study. Firstly, an overview of the construction of identity positions and knowledge by memoir authors highlights the way in which they create separations between themselves and other tourists. This separation runs counter to this study's aim of opening up new space for considering tourism and tourists, however, the possibilities for alternate readings of these texts are highlighted, and are used to demonstrate their continuing value for this study. Secondly, a consideration of two instances of gazing is used to re-consider the boundaries between touristic and non-touristic practices. This boundary is further examined in two mobilities that involve differential interactions with established tourist infrastructures. Using the particularities of these cases, it is argued that tourism must be opened up to considerations of not only material and industrial infrastructures, but also to virtual and cultural infrastructures and spatializations. Finally, the chapter closes with a consideration of how place, space, and spatializations are worked into the memoirs, and further support the need for considerations of the intangible infrastructures that support tourism.

Discourses on tourism

Though the memoirs of this study provide support for this existence of touristic change within spaces, they do not frame it as such. Rather, authors establish clear separations between their roles and knowledge and that of tourists. In the second home memoirs, this boundary is a strict demarcation that is sometimes marked by conflict. Return home memoirs, on the other hand, enunciate a less rigid distinction between tourists and returnees.

Constructing second home roles and knowledge

For MacGregor, there is a clear and important distinction between tourists and locals, and this distinction is one that he elaborates at length (2002, pp. 197-237). MacGregor characterizes the relationship between tourists and locals as a colonial one that leaves locals aware of the benefits, but still upset by the feeling that they are being taken advantage while the real money lies elsewhere (2002, p. 227). "Tourists, in this strange, bipolar world where both sides view the other as somewhat lacking, are held not to be particularly bright by the locals" because they lack local knowledge and an appreciation

of the important aspects of local society and spaces (MacGregor, 2002, p. 227). The relationship between locals and tourists is thus constructed by MacGregor as involving a lack of respect, resentment, and methods of coping: "The defense mechanism, for those who live here year round, is to look down on those who come before the visitors can look down – as surely they are doing – on those already here" (2002, p. 227). This preemptive disrespect is justified by observations of the tourists' position as outsiders and their lack of what is deemed important local knowledge about the particularities of area history, wildlife, and practices (MacGregor, 2002, p. 228). Thus, though the relationship between tourists and locals is marked by symbiosis (MacGregor, 2002, p. 228, 2005, p. 138), it is an uneasy one.

This representation of the relationship between tourists and locals illustrates a clear separation, and an accompanying valuation of their roles within society. The tourists are looked down upon for being from away, as well as for the negative impact they are deemed to have upon local spaces and culture. This sharp assessment of tourists, however, is complicated upon reflection on the role MacGregor attributes to himself within the text. Though his primary home is elsewhere, and he only resides in the Muskoka cottage area for portions of the year, MacGregor claims for himself the role of local within his binary. This claim is validated in part by his long history with the Algonquin Park region, having grown up in a town nearby and owned a cottage there for many years. Yet, his infrequent residence during both the summer and winter months challenges his status as a local. In addition, his discussion of this relationship between tourists and locals comes out of the story of his cruise along a stretch of lakeshore nicknamed Millionaires' Row. This cruise is, as he notes, a central part of the tourist infrastructure, and though he doesn't portray himself racing to take pictures of the giant houses along with the other tourists, he does eagerly observe and analyze the tourists. Thus, even if he is not solely concerned with the cottages along the shore, he still uses the tourist infrastructure and shares in the gazing that takes place. Therefore, though MacGregor's discourse itself maintains a rigid separation between his own social position and that of tourists, in the process establishing differences between the practices and knowledge of each, there is ample room for resistant readings of his claim to not be a tourist.

A demarcation between the belonging of second home visitors and the outsider status of tourists is presented in a more moderated fashion in Gable and Gable's text. Due to the unique status of their second home as a noted architectural landmark, the Gables often open up the main floor of their Villa to groups of tourists, whose presence is portrayed positively. Over time, Sally becomes an expert guide for these tours of their second home, and the Gables decide to write and print a booklet to provide tourists with more information and a souvenir of their visit (Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 39-43, 93-99). This relationship between tourists and second-home owners is thus constructed as less hostile and challenging than in MacGregor's discourse.

Though they comment upon encountering tourists, the Gables do not often represent themselves as tourists in and around their second home. They admit to being tourists on their first visit to Venice (Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 204-208), but then normalize the

trips they undertake after purchasing their second home. Thus when they later tour Italian friends around Venice, they feel "like natives showing our home" (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 246). Their separation from tourists is further emphasized in passages that highlight the attractions in Venice that are important to them, and name these as being often overlooked by tourists (Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 88, 140). Thus Gable and Gable, like MacGregor, establish second-home owners and tourists as independent roles. Though the relationship between these groups is marked by less conflict than in MacGregor's presentation, there remains a clear distinction between the bodies of knowledge accessible to each.

In Gordon's texts, he enunciates many different categories of social positions. At times, the ideal cottager is compared to tourists, whose strange desires have come to negatively influence the items for sale in the closest town (Gordon, 2006, pp. 73-74, 116). At other times, the true cottager is valued over the false cottager, or the old type of cottager over the new, modern type (Gordon, 2006, pp. 16-17, 50-15). No matter the labels, there is a consistency in the connection between valued roles and the past. Superior individuals practice the old way of doing things, with fewer gadgets and fewer amenities in their cottages. Simplicity and nature are also lauded, and anything that distracts from them becomes an annoyance.

Despite this elaboration of separate roles, Gordon's text is filled with self-contradictions, and he ends up challenging the very categories he outlines. He undermines his suggestion that cottagers are an insider community by noting that cottagers are visitors, even if they don't see themselves as such (Gordon, 1989, p. 151, 2006, p. 73). With the humor that characterizes his text, Gordon observes that "tourists are people who are around for a matter of days, as opposed to you, who are around for a matter of weeks" (1989, p. 112). Thus even though this text establishes that there are preferable roles and relationships surrounding second homes, the determination and sanctity of these roles is left open to criticism.

Constructing returnee roles and knowledge

Whereas the second home memoirs in this study construct clear distinctions between tourists and second home visitors, the return home memoirs present a more fluid understanding of tourist roles. Rather than discussing tourists as a separate and negatively valued population, these texts normalize tourism and visitors. Chiang, for example, doesn't mention 'tourists' often, but does speak of visitors, and openly includes himself among this category (1977). Phillips uses both terms, but has no overt bias when discussing tourists and does not take pains to separate herself from this category (1990). In Bainbridge's text, he refers to tourism as something undertaken by both visitors and local residents (2002, pp. 180, 286), and admits to taking on this role himself: "We decided to play the tourist role to the hilt, and to return to the other end of town by boat" (2002, p. 58). In these texts, experiences of return are thus constructed as being compatible with those of tourism.

This willingness of narrators to associate themselves with tourists is not unexpected, because their return home mobilities incorporate both stops to visit family and to undertake touristic practices in other cities and regions. Chiang uses his return trip as an opportunity to visit many parts of China – both those he had visited while living in the country and those that he hadn't (1977). Phillips, over the decades of her relationship with China, lived in several different areas, and after 1960 she led tours to parts of China that were both familiar and unfamiliar to her (1990). This intermingling of return home and touristic mobilities is also experienced by Blaise and Mukherjee, who visit Europe for a month before reaching Mukherjee's former home in India (1977, p. 9). Touristic tours and visits to unfamiliar places are incorporated into these return home mobilities, and they create a context whereby the narrator's social roles and practices can become marked by a combination of touristic and non-touristic qualities.

Though these texts construct tourist roles in a more positive light that the second home texts, they still elaborate hierarchies of social positions. For Chiang, hierarchies are marked by his repeated use of the term 'China-born Chinese'. Chiang takes on this label to describe himself, and attaches to it a sense of authenticity and privilege. He argues that his status as a 'China-born Chinese' gives him "deeper insight and interpretation" into the situations he encounters on his return trip (1977, p. 14), and in other places he attributes particular weight to his feelings of joy as a 'China-born Chinese' (1977, p. 160). This enunciation makes his connection to China not only cultural, but also marked by a previous inhabitation of the space of China, and is used to lend an air of validity to his observations, while also setting aside his experiences as unique and unattainable for most individuals. The narrator's uniqueness is further supported by his repeated statements that few others could understand what he felt and was going through (Chiang, 1977, pp. 34, 53, 56). By isolating his experience in this way, Chiang constructs a privileged position for himself, as a returning Chinese, which is connected to a privileged relationship to the space and place of China, and marks his knowledge of China as more authentic and valid than the knowledge of those who have not known the space and place personally.

Phillips and Mukherjee, in their personal narratives of encountering change upon return, also highlight their unique position in comparison to other visitors. As highlighted above, this approach leads Phillips to dismiss the viewpoint of her travel companions, who are deemed to lack the knowledge or history or identity to fully understand the situations of their travel experiences, while Mukherjee becomes suspicious of all tourists and their attitude towards locals (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 220; Phillips, 1990, p. 111). Thus, all three return home texts validate the superiority and uniqueness of the returnee's knowledge, and emphasize that returnees have access to local knowledge within exclusive communities, even despite their long absences from these spaces.

Though all of these texts carefully construct divisions and separations between tourists and second home or return home visitors, these discourses do not stand in the way of assessments of the touristic change within these cases. First, as has been illustrated, resistant readings of these texts can challenge the authors' claims to be different from tourists. Second, the conceptualizations of tourism and tourists that memoir authors incorporate suggest connections to the geographically deterministic conceptualizations

that this study seeks to problematize. Though studies of tourism must take into consideration the categorizations used by travellers themselves, including the instances in which travellers understand their travels by virtue of their departure from a static home or in which they deny the label of 'tourist', these personal assessments are tied up within spatializations and ideologies of tourism that are perpetuated by popular and academic literature. In this way, authors' categories can come to reflect and perpetuate framings within other discourses. We need therefore to continue to investigate the weaknesses of current conceptualizations of tourism, so that new insights that reflect previously ignored components of individuals' experiences can be discovered. As the cases of this study show, suggestions for change already exist even within discourses that contest the new framing of tourism outlined here.

Finally, the radical opening up of tourism to potentially occupy all spaces brings into question the operation of 'tourist' as a role. Though, as some have argued, there is a distinction to be noted between those tourists for whom integration into communities is of little concern and other travellers who engage in and with the communities they enter (cf. Cohen's five modes of touristic experience, 1979), the possibility for touristic practices in any space, including one's primary home, complicates the application of differing labels. In the past, distinguishing between different levels of integration into a community has often relied on an assumption of the pre-existing difference of this community. When cultural and social distinctions are not as apparent, however, for example when individuals travel to other areas of their own country, defining integration becomes more difficult. Furthermore, this approach acknowledges only the movement of the tourist to establish change, rather than the movement of other individuals or goods that can bring novelty and change to familiar home spaces. While utilizing an understanding of the touristic as existing within spaces, this concept of integration becomes challenging. Though more work will need to be done to examine how integration, as an element of the tourist role, can be articulated within new geographies of tourism, for the time being this distinction will be set aside to focus upon not tourists, but rather individuals' touristic practices. The following section considers the way in which the outlining of acceptable spaces of tourism has obscured the similarities between instances of touristic practices such as gazing.

Along the continuum of touristic practices

Considering then the role that touristic practices can play within second home mobilities, touristic engagements with change can be seen to come in many forms. Though not framed as touristic events within memoirs, these practices do engage with changes within space, and thus highlight the continuum along which touristic practices lie.

In Roy MacGregor's *Escape: in search of the natural soul of Canada*, he presents two instances of gazing in and around his second home that speak to the similarities between practices that are routinely framed as touristic and those that are not (2002). The practice of gazing has been a long-held and -studied touristic activity, and yet gazing is not limited to particular touristic spheres of life.[xxii] The first passage from this memoir

concerns a tourist cruise briefly highlighted earlier, and the second examines gazing that occurs much closer to MacGregor's second home.

In the first passage (2002, pp. 199-237), MacGregor is on the deck of a boat cruising through waters of Lake Muskoka.[xxiii] The two and a half hour cruise costs only sixteen dollars, and caters primarily to tourists, who come to see the enormous million-dollar cottages lining the shore. On this cruise, MacGregor is surrounded by tourists who are performing recognized tourist practices:

> the passengers are taking photographs of everything the ship passes by. It is understandable, for back home in Japan and the United States and Great Britain and Germany and France and even Toronto, they may be called upon to prove some of the more outlandish claims they will take with them when they disembark. (2002, p. 213)

Though MacGregor acknowledges why the tourists take copious photographs, he still denigrates this practice, and constructs a separation between himself and this group of tourists. He distinguishes himself from the tourists by describing these fellow passengers as a generic group, and also describing the trip with a detachment that does not outwardly acknowledge or implicate him in the gazing which the cruise facilitates. Through carefully constructed discourse, MacGregor makes it clear that though he is participating in the same cruise, his detached observation and local knowledge distinguish him from others. As the story of the cruise continues, MacGregor's distaste for tourists, and their practices, becomes more apparent. He sardonically observes:

> The cruise down Millionaires' Row would be dangerous if [the boat] *Lady Muskoka* were not so large and stable, for the tourists race from port to starboard as the Gatsby-like summer homes reel by. They take photographs and point and stare, tongues hanging out like docks reaching into the channel that runs between Squirrel and Tondern islands. (2002, p. 217)

The tourists' excitement and thirst to visually consume the giant cottages is presented with distain, and this sentiment carries MacGregor into a rant concerning the more general relationship between locals and tourists.[xxiv]

Though MacGregor's text constructs a distinct social hierarchy that devalues the gaze and practices of tourists, a second example of gazing in the text can be used to argue that it is this constructed position and not the practice itself that has been evaluated. Thus, redefining tourism spaces opens up space for alternate readings of these practices.

Unlike many second-home owners, MacGregor makes use of his cottage year round. As trips during winter encompass a unique part of his second home experience, an entire chapter in his memoir is devoted to discussing this portion of his mobility (MacGregor, 2002, pp. 177-195). During this section, MacGregor goes into great detail about the many tasks required to make the cottage habitable in the winter. He argues that it is after having found the woodpile, drilled a hole for water in the lake and started a fire that the real exploration begins:

> For the next few days, it is like discovering that the place you once believed you knew best has a different personality. When the leaves are down, there are no more secrets in cottage country; winter is a snooper's paradise for those who

> wondered, a few months earlier, what all the hammering and sawing was about on the far side of the island. There is something naked about the lake; not only can you see so much more, but you can walk along the shoreline far closer to neighbours' properties than you would ever dare paddle in summer. No one is there to catch you gawking. (2002, p. 189)

Though in a different space, and under different circumstances that do not rely on tourist infrastructure, this anecdote outlines a practice of gazing that is similar to that of tourists on Lake Muskoka. MacGregor travels along the shoreline in order to gaze at neighboring cottages, and in this instance doing so is a valued practice that is notable because it can be more effectively undertaken in the winter. This assessment that the changes winter brings to the cottage make gazing better suggests that gazing occurs during the summer as well, but is not as rewarding because you can't get as close and there are neighbours to catch you staring.

In this way, the gazing upon change that is central to the tourists' practices on the Muskoka cruise is also part of MacGregor's experience at his second home. The tourists have a differing level of knowledge of surrounding spaces than MacGregor, but the gazing is marked in both cases by a desire to see something different. For MacGregor, the winter brings a chance to gaze upon changes that have occurred within a space that is familiar. The Muskoka tourists occupy the other end of the continuum, looking upon cottages that are likely entirely unknown to them, and therefore mark a significant change between spaces of their experience. Though the distinctions between these events are important, in the context of this study it becomes a qualitative distinction within the realm of the touristic. As these examples suggest, assessments of the spatial contexts of these practices, rather than the practices themselves, have contributed to judgments that they are not both touristic. This study argues that we should consider a continuum of touristic practices, wherein tourism is not decided by spatial determinants, and both the gazing of tourists and of second home visitors in MacGregor's text are seen to reveal engagements with change that mark them as touristic.

A tale of two tourisms

Having thus established the notion of a continuum of touristic practices, this section moves on to consider how touristic practices can be connected to touristic spaces and mobilities. Two mobilities within MacGregor's second home narrative provide striking illustrations of the factors that contribute to the recognition and naming of touristic mobilities. Highlighting how the touristic can be named in each case brings an awareness of the importance of considering not only the material infrastructure that can come to identify tourism, but also the role of intangible social structures in determinations of tourism.

Up the Crow River

MacGregor's text includes the story of several adventures undertaken in the vicinity of his second home. Among these is an overnight canoe trip up the Crow River taken while the narrator is living at his second home on Camp Lake. The Crow River is situated in the

interior of Algonquin Park, a short distance from the narrator's cabin, and is a popular destination for guided and non-guided canoe trips. The mobility is addressed in the third chapter of MacGregor's work, and involves the narrator Roy, his wife Ellen, and their friends the Harrises, who are visiting from Saskatchewan (2002, pp. 77-131).

After unloading their cars at long-term parking, the group sets out without a guide to find the last remaining stand of white pine trees in the park. In order to save time, they load their three canoes and gear onto a water taxi that takes them across the lake to a landing where, with backpacks and canoes in hand, they start the 1400-meter portage at the beginning of their journey. Along the way they encounter several groups of returning canoeists, including a pair of young Japanese men who amuse them with tales of misadventure and a German tourist pulling a piece of rolling luggage, something MacGregor deems an absurd accessory for a canoeing trip.

After completing the portage, the MacGregors and Harrises start the first of several days in their canoes, stopping every night to set up camp when they come to a good spot or feel a storm threatening. Along the way they stop to swim, play balancing games on their canoes, and explore a stretch of white sand beach that is marked with fresh bear tracks.

On the third day they reach the old dam on the Crow River where they must leave their canoes in order to hike the final mile to their destination on foot. The hike, though long, is along a trail that has been frequently used. As they climb over rocks and roots, they admire the holes and scratches that are littered across the beech trunks they pass – remnants of the activity of bears in the region. The hike becomes more challenging, leading MacGregor to wonder if there will be a sign to tell them when they have arrived, until they finally emerge among the massive white pine trees, whose wide trunks stretch up into the sky for more than one hundred feet, surrounding and silencing them: "It was as if we had left the bush we'd been hiking through and entered a world of giantism, where dozens of stunningly high trees stood over the paltry forests like lords over the common" (MacGregor, 2002, p. 118). Having finally reached the "sacred grove", MacGregor comments that he has "never felt so small and insignificant in [his] life" (2002, p. 118). Their arrival is as spectacular as they imagined.

Setting up camp that night, they are pleasantly surprised by a large cow moose that is wandering near their campsite, and after taking several pictures, they hunker down in their tents to endure a fierce storm. Waking the next morning, they discover that the moose has spent the night by their campsite, a guardian in the storm. She remains as they pack up their equipment, and then follows their canoes a short distance into the lake as they begin their return trip. At times the wind makes the paddling difficult as they work their way back, but they press on, and before long they are back at the portage and then, after taking another water taxi ride, the story of their trip up the Crow River comes to an end.

Though this trip originates for the narrator at his second home, which is located quite close to the Crow River, the touristic elements of the mobility are easily identifiable. The Harrises and the Japanese and German tourists either take part in or are encountered on

this trip, and they all fit technical definitions of tourism. These individuals, along with the presence of tourist infrastructure in the form of a canoe rental company and water taxi, help to mark the Crow River and the unique white pine trees at its end as tourist attractions that are part of the tourist industry. In addition to marveling at the main attraction on their trip, the white pine, the MacGregors and Harrises take 'dozens' of pictures when their campsite it visited by the cow moose (MacGregor, 2002, pp. 125-126), and gazing and picture taking are practices that fit into the classic repertoire of touristic practices. Even though the narrator and his wife may not fit traditional definitions of tourism, their journey is to a tourist attraction, and they undertake recognized tourist practices, therefore it is not difficult to conceive of their mobility as a touristic vacation from their second home experience.

Though this analysis allows an understanding of how tourism can be incorporated into second home mobilities, in this case as a vacation from the vacation to a second home, it still remains closely tied to understandings of tourism stemming from its connection to a commoditized industry of services and signs. A second mobility presented in MacGregor's text helps to illustrate how understandings of tourism within second home mobilities can be expanded beyond the limits of the tourism industry.

The search for Ermine Lake

While the trip up the Crow River is discernable as a circular travel mobility, visiting Ermine Lake requires a more complex search that extends over a longer timeframe and includes many more spaces (MacGregor, 2002, pp. 1-43). Ermine Lake is also in Algonquin Park, near the narrator's cabin on Camp Lake, and this lake sparks the attention of the narrator Roy and his friend John because it has what Roy refers to as "blank spaces" around it on their old topographical map (MacGregor, 2002, p. 4). Though it is located near old logging roads and was once stocked with trout, the lake is cut off from current human mobilities. As a result, MacGregor asserts that its shoreline remains untouched, and the islands within its waters are unexplored. The promise of such pristine nature is very appealing, and Roy and John decide they must see it for themselves.

On their first trip, Roy and John boat to the end of Flossie Lake, where they leave the boat and set off with a few supplies and a map along an old logging road that is grown over, but still visible due to variations in the height of vegetation. At first the way seems apparent, but it isn't long before they have to diverge from the logging road and head through the disorienting bush. Less and less certain of their direction, they finally come upon water, but discover that it belongs not to Ermine Lake but to the bay where they tied their boat at the beginning of the trip. Their second effort to find the elusive Ermine Lake involves more uncertain wandering, a similarly small set of supplies, and another futile expense of effort.

After each failure, Roy and John spent more time poring over their maps, trying to figure out where they could have gone wrong, and preparing themselves mentally to try again. Family and fellow cottagers hear of the stories and begin to hassle Roy and John, who are

moved to justify themselves: "the more they laughed at our inability to find the obvious, the more we covered up with elaborate explanations" (MacGregor, 2002, p. 13). They begin to boast that Ermine is so special that it deserves a "full-blown expedition . . . to prove once and for all that [it is] a lake like no other" (MacGregor, 2002, p. 14). Thus, over the winter they exchange emails and create plans that will lead them to success.

The next summer, they return to the lake and try once again. Made curious by previous summers' discussions, John's family and fellow cottager Dennis decide to join the search party. With the aid of a newly added compass and the kids' keen ears, the explorers manage to avoid going in circles and find their way through the bush to Ermine Lake. Initially, Roy is disappointed because there is a disparity between his mental image of the lake, culled through hours of imaginings and myth making, and its actual physical form. This disappointment, however, soon recedes.

As the children rest, Roy and Denis decide to go for a swim to one of the islands, and when they crawl through the dense brush and roots at its edge, they discover a great blue heron colony. Such colonies are extremely rare and are seldom seen by humans because they are usually located in isolated areas. Finding one thus makes their visit to Ermine Lake nothing short of extraordinary, and Roy returns to his cottage, content that his story of the heron colony will help to preserve the mysticism of Ermine Lake within his second home community.

Though the mobilities connected to Ermine Lake are not recognizable as part of the tourism industry, they still retain many touristic qualities. Like the trip up the Crow River, the trips in search of Ermine Lake are undertaken with the expectation of pleasure from encountering uniqueness or change in the world. This touristic quality can be present regardless of the distance involved in the travel or the infrastructure that might support it. Both the stand of great white pine trees, and the undiscovered Ermine Lake are unique sites that differ from other parts of Algonquin Park. Their uniqueness is not only enjoyed once the sites have been reached, but is also a factor in inspiring and instigating these mobilities. Thus, I argue that the trip up the Crow River and the multiple trips in search of Ermine Lake are pleasurable engagements with change and novelty, and as such are touristic practices within second home mobilities. Though these trips do not fit prevalent spatializations of circular tourism based around a primary home, an examination of the particularities of these mobilities reveals the commonalities they share. Recognizing the limitations of previous spatializations of tourism then, we must consider how the mobilities around the Crow River and Ermine Lake are both touristic engagements with change. The next section considers this assertion in more detail, and outlines how material and immaterial infrastructure can be seen to support these touristic engagements.

Structures of tourism

Though an understanding of the touristic as bound up with changes between and within spaces is an integral step for opening up the sphere of tourism, it is not without challenges. Especially in the case of change within spaces, there is the danger that this

qualification could become overly personal. As Gordon notes when speaking of the wilderness, it "is a state of mind. For some, the wilderness is life without electricity, away from all humanity, in places no one has been before. For other people, the wilderness is a place with only black-and-white TV" (1989, p. 43). When a place can have diverse manifestations in this way, assessing change threatens to be an activity that is necessarily personal and isolated. Then the arguments presented here, which are based on resistant readings of personal narratives, can be dismissed as similarly personal assessments. Limited subjective understandings of tourism can be avoided, however, as Eric Cohen suggests, by considering how social structures support and socially-define tourism independently of personal identification with the role or experiences of a tourist (1974). Consideration must be given not only to the insights of personal determinations of change, but also to the various structural supports for tourism.

In the case of MacGregor's mobilities highlighted above, the structures supporting each touristic engagement differ markedly in their form. The trip up the Crow River relies upon the material infrastructure of the tourism industry. Considering the role of physical, industrial structures in the search for Ermine Lake, however, makes it apparent that a lack of tangible structural support contributes to the difficulty Roy and John have in finding Ermine Lake. Unlike the stand of white pine on the Crow River, Ermine Lake lacks the most basic infrastructure in terms of access roads or paths. This lack of infrastructure contributes to the difficulty they have in adapting to the change they confront (cf. Greenblat and Gagnon, 1983) and also contributes to the failure of their early trips.

Though the search for Ermine Lake lacks notable material structures for tourism, it also demonstrates significant similarities with other types of tourism. There are, for example, similarities between the voyage to Ermine Lake and the types of adventure tourism that allow individuals to explore natural areas with few structural supports. Like the search for Ermine Lake, certain types of backcountry camping also demonstrate very few material supports for touristic activity. In these cases, limited material infrastructure actually increases the value of the trips and, in MacGregor's case, of the lake itself. Furthermore, this similarity between the mobilities surrounding Ermine Lake and adventure tourism points to a shared intangible social structure, and suggests that despite the lack of tangible, commoditized structures, the trip to Ermine Lake has intangible supports that can mark it as touristic.

These intangible structural supports that mark both adventure tourism and the search for Ermine Lake as touristic come primarily in the form of mythologies and ideologies that are tied up in social spatializations. Both of MacGregor's mobilities highlighted here involve unique natural phenomena and interact with cultural mythologies and ideologies that laud the authenticity and value of nature. Summers, cottages, camping, canoeing, and nature are all entrenched within cultural mythologies, especially within Canada (Jaakson, 1986). They are part of folklore, and as such their spaces and the practices that occur within them are collectively spatialized as comforting and utopian. Furthermore, the space of second homes are seen to foster an increased awareness of nature and a desire to seek it out, as well as a sense of continuity and family unity (Jaakson, 1986). Such themes have been noted within many cultural mythologies of second homes, as noted in

the previous chapter, and these mythologies feed spatializations of second homes and nature as ideal locales.[xxv]

David Macfarlane's novel *Summer Gone* (1999) engages deeply with such myths, and illustrates that even individuals without personal experience at summer homes can become attached to cottage culture and folklore. That is, the spatializations of summer homes are accessible to people regardless of whether they have had the opportunity inhabit such spaces. When the son in Macfarlane's novel asks his father where his connection with 'summer stuff' came from, the father speculates:

> From books, I guess, or magazines. From what other kids at school told me about their summers at cottages or at camp. Or from what my mother told me about my parents' annual visit to Timberside Lodge with the company. . . . I think I just took my summers and invented their opposites. I sometimes think that I knew the details of a summer cottage because the house that I grew up in was a kind of anti-cottage. (Macfarlane, 1999, p. 165)

In this way, media representations, anecdotes from friends and family, and experiences of a distinctly different space communicate a spatialization of the cottage that is inherently appealing. These resources, and thus the spatialization, are not universally accessible, a point that will be revisited later, but nonetheless "there is a culture centered on the cottage" that gives the place "a deep, almost mystical, meaning to many Canadians" (Jaakson, 1986, p. 371). Though an abstract structure, this culturally-specific spatialization has particular effects upon tourism.

Spatializations affect tourism by acting as intangible structural supports for the enunciation of good change between or within spaces. In the examples above, this spatialization comes in the form of supporting valuations of nature. Tourism of the body and nature has been recognized as a key manifestation of the recent growth in forms of embodied tourism (Franklin, 2003, pp. 213-249). Franklin argues that the appeal of the natural landscapes, what here would be identified as spatialized locations, was not always as self-evident as it appears today. Indeed, he argues that it is only as a result of particular cultural values that such locations are now deemed naturally appealing sites for tourism (Franklin, 2003, pp. 213-214). New spatializations of nature have thus marked it as an appealing space, and one that Gordon argues makes cottage country like a Third World tourist attraction, which draws visitors who want to experience its unspoiled natural attributes (2006, p. 14). Positive spatializations of the cottage and second homes similarly support and encourage touristic trips to experience family unity within untarnished natural sites and phenomena. For the many people who live in cities, the change of a natural site is not only valued, but also easily labeled as touristic change.

Therefore, though MacGregor's search for Ermine Lake is not marked by significant material structures that support tourism, intangible spatializations support the change he experiences. Though not all engagements with nature are structurally part of the tourist industry, they share ideological structures that shape understandings of what activities and locations are desirable for touristic engagements. In addition to these valuations of space, comparisons between spatializations – in this case of MacGregor's second home and of Ermine Lake – reveal significant differences that can mark these mobilities as

engaging with touristic change. Ermine Lake is spatialized as pristine wilderness, untouched by humans, which is a stark contrast from the development and cottage community at Camp Lake. Even though he is already at his cottage and in the midst of nature, MacGregor's search for Ermine Lake marks an engagement with spatializations of an even more remote and pristine site. In this way, the intangible social structures surrounding this segment of mobility mark it as engaging with change, and thus, as a touristic engagement with Ermine Lake.

While re-engaging with understandings of tourism then, we should also re-consider the types of tangible and intangible social structures that support them. Social spatializations have a significant role in marking off spaces as desirable, or as significantly different from one another. These intangible structures must therefore be considered alongside material ones. Doing so will ensure that determinations of change do not become confined to personal opinions, or conversely based on unstated assumptions of the cultural change or difference inherent in long-distance travel. The broader importance of spatializations within second-home and return-home mobilities is further elaborated in the next section.

Places, space, and spatializations

In addition to providing an alternate strategy for considering the structural supports for tourism, spatializations appear as active components of memoir author's negotiations of space and place. Within the texts of these memoirs, some authors show active engagements with not only the spaces and places within their narratives, but also the spatializations that feed their assessments of space and place. Their texts demonstrate the process of negotiation by which spatialized assessments of space interact with personal enactments of place, and contribute to further enunciations of spatialization.

Through the interweaving of history, literary criticism, mythology and personal experience, MacGregor's text not only becomes an ode to the particular space of Algonquin Park, but also reinforces the importance of the virtual place of his second home and broader spatializations of second home and nature. Much of MacGregor's memoir addresses his personal experiences in and around his family cottage, but rather than framing the text solely as a personal cottage memoir, MacGregor chose to highlight the theme of escape, which he deems to be crucially and inextricably connected to nature and to Canada.[xxvi] In this way, MacGregor discusses and establishes the place and the space of his cottage in dialogue with spatializations of nature. Cottages, he argues, are for escape, their purpose to facilitate contact with nature (MacGregor, 2002, p. 262, 2005, p. 148).

The practices highlighted in MacGregor's text are predominantly concerned with active engagements with nature, as in the case of canoeing, swimming, hiking, and ice-skating. These practices are validated within spatializations of cottages, and help to order the place of the cottage around a connection with nature. These practices also connect the place of his cottage to spatializations of a simpler and older lifestyle that is deemed attainable in close contact to nature. Using an outhouse, building a fire for heat, and

getting water from a lake are all practices more common to a previous historical period, and they thus connect the ordered place of the cottage to nostalgic images of the past.[xxvii] Though MacGregor portrays a hierarchy of desirable cottage practices, in the end he emphasizes that it is the place, not the space that is important:

> It doesn't really matter whether we call it cottage or camp, whether it is owned or rented or borrowed, whether it is one of the $9.5-million monstrosities of the Muskoka lakes, a simple, banged-up camper trailer on the banks of a northern river, or a park campsite you need to book months in advance: they are all equal in the state of mind they produce. (MacGregor, 2005, p. xvii)

In addition to providing personal anecdotes to support the connection he establishes between cottages and Canadian experiences of escape to nature, MacGregor makes use of intertextual references that are loosely attributed to various explorers and naturalists (2002, pp. 47-75). These paraphrases and quotations are peppered throughout his personal stories, and serve as a counterpoint that emphasizes his personal observations, either by affirming his evaluations of nature or providing countering opinions that he can then refute. Articulating differing spatializations that are created by others who are not a part of his own story allows MacGregor to construct a consensus around his own spatialization of nature as a vein for escape.

By framing his experiences within a context of Canadian searches for escape in nature, MacGregor draws from and contributes to spatializations of the cottage as a valued and mythic Canadian place. MacGregor's memoir thus can be seen to actively mythologize and spatialize the cottage, while also testifying to the author's connection to this valued place.

Though Gordon's cottage musings are framed within a strikingly different style, they also form an ode to the place of the cottage (2006). By making extensive use of hyperbole, self-deprecation, contradiction, and irony, and by mocking the conventions of writing forms such as meeting minutes and scientific studies, Gordon paints a lighthearted picture of second home life. Though Gordon's truth claims are often farcical, they do not subvert an underlying assumption of the worth of cottages and the existence of an ideal cottage.

The lore Gordon spins about the cottage builds it up as a place of respite, triumph, tradition, and family, somewhere to touch nature and engage with a life of simplicity. Gordon thematically addresses many of the iconic elements of both cottage life and encounters with nature – weather, bugs, fishing, repairs – and though he exaggerates many common cultural myths about nature, his attention to them acknowledges their importance to cottage life. Many of the practices Gordon highlights involve engaging with nature-based leisure pursuits such as fishing and bird watching, and others center on the family and interactions with children and grandparents. These connections to nature and personal relationships become integrated into the valued place of the cottage, and mark it as a place connected to nature and a sense of community.

The space of the cottage is seen by Gordon to be both important and unimportant in comparison. While on one hand the size of the cottage isn't seen to make a difference

when encountering equalizing factors like the weather, Gordon also highlights that a lack of technology and amenities is ideal. Certain practices are also preferred:

> At the best kind of cottage, not much [other than weather] is happening to talk about. There are few events, no agenda for the next day, no news, nothing on TV, ideally no TV. And since we have to talk about something, the weather has been it, almost by default, and because it is so interesting. (Gordon, 2006, p. 89)

As in MacGregor's text, the place of the cottage is thus connected to spatialized practices that hail a previous historical period, and a more direct connection with nature than is attainable when living in the city.

The practices in this text thus underline a similar conception of place as is presented by MacGregor, which feeds into and off of mythologies and spatializations of nature and the existence of a simpler lifestyle in the past. Regardless of changes that occur over time, there is a sense of the timelessness that surrounds this much loved and respected place: "No matter what has happened around you in seventeen years, no matter who has bought the place across the lake and put a wind turbine on it, your place still has the old effect on you" (Gordon, 2006, p. 11). That is, there is a timeless quality to spatializations of the cottage, and to the particular ordered place of your own.

In addition to facilitating a sense of continuity within cottage practices, this timelessness also sparks comparisons between recent memories of the place of the cottage and the possibilities held within spatializations of it:

> The long drive home on Labour Day is the sadder for having to mull over, during the usual traffic delays, the knowledge that the summer of the mind, the summer of non-stop fun, will have to wait until next year. . . . In the summer of the mind, as in the beer commercials, the waters are always calm. The fast boats and other gas-powered gadgets that speed by on the lake never make noise. The beer in television commercials never makes anybody sick. The neighbours in television commercials never complain. This year, it wasn't like that at all, but maybe next year it will be. . . . It is difficult for a real live summer to live up to such expectations, and it rarely does, which is one reason why it is seen off with such regret. One more week, maybe only a couple of days more, and the summer might have fulfilled its promise. (Gordon, 1989, pp. 214-215)

Here, the recently placed memories of the cottage are seen to pale in comparison to the abstract possibilities attributed to the space. Yet, hope exists that these possibilities will someday be realized. Spatializations thus help to inform not only the valuations of space and the ordering of material interactions with place, but also the possibilities inherent in each. In the end, though Gordon's text has a much more tenuous connection to personal experiences at the cottage, that is, the use of hyperbole and irony construct iconic spatializations more often than identifiably personal situations, it still constructs a similar image of the place of the cottage, as something fundamental to identity and integrated into the spatializations of Canadian nature.

In this way, spatializations have an important role within these narratives of marginal tourism mobilities. Thus, their role as intangible infrastructures for touristic engagement must be further considered in future studies.

Conclusion

This chapter has established some of the important contributions that return home and second home mobilities can make to understandings of the touristic. Though the memoir authors in this study do not frame their mobilities as fundamentally touristic, they nonetheless include passages that speak strikingly of touristic experiences, even if they are not labeled as such. Change and novelty, often identified as characteristics of tourism, have been considered here as existing not only in the comparison between spaces, but also as a component of mobilities and transit that is integrated into experiences and comparisons within one space. This understanding is important for opening up considerations of tourism and change. It allows us to acknowledge the similarities between different spaces within mobilities. It also creates the possibility for tourism and the integration of changes to exist anywhere, including in home and other familiar spaces.

Mobilities from MacGregor's memoir have demonstrated how understandings of touristic practices can be stretched beyond familiar labels to include instances of gazing that are not supported by the infrastructure of the tourism industry. MacGregor's text thus highlights the importance of continuing to look beyond the boundaries of the tourism industry when considering the possibility for touristic practices and mobilities. MacGregor's mobilities also highlight the important role of intangible social structures, spatializations and virtual place within extended mobilities. It has therefore been suggested that considerations of tourism examine not only the material infrastructures that support touristic practices, but also the virtual infrastructures, such as webs of spatialization. These virtual infrastructures are important in marking desirable changes and encouraging engagement with mobility and change.

In this chapter, examples of unique portions of touristic mobilities have illustrated the way in which previous determinations of tourism have been based heavily on notions of a correct spatialized journey for tourism. Eliminating the need for such a home-based, circular spatialization, this study is able to look more closely at portions of marginal tourism mobilities and reconsider how change and novelty are present within them. This approach has opened space to consider how change occurs within spaces, and how intangible infrastructures support tourism. Having then established the importance of a more relational conception of the change involved in tourism, of the continuum of possible touristic practices, and of the multiple types of touristic infrastructure, the next chapter goes on to consider in more detail the importance of virtual place in practices and mobilities of tourism. Memoir authors highlight complex interactions of space and place and practices, and thus begin to open up further relationships that must be considered in an examination of the touristic.

Chapter Four – Over time and space – connections between spaces, places, and practices

As the last chapter showed, the texts of this study suggest new ways of considering the touristic as involving change within spaces, as engaged with intangible structures and as intermittently present in mobilities. In addition to these theoretical insights, the texts highlight interactions of space, place, and practices that are overlooked by many studies of tourism.

While most studies of tourism focus upon particular tourist locations and then consider the practices undertaken in these locations, often with reference to the change established in comparison to everyday spaces and activities, the cases of this study demonstrate the importance of considering more complex interactions between place, space, and practices. This chapter shows that authors indicate the importance of interacting with mobile, intangible places and memories in many different locations. As well, the discussions of second homes or previous homes are intertwined with discussions of primary homes, surrounding spaces, and other vacation sites. These frames of multiple spaces and places become integral to understanding why touristic practices are undertaken, and help to furnish understandings of mobile constructions of place and how leaving home to interact with other spaces and places can instigate change and touristic practices of the everyday upon returning home. All of these interactions demonstrate the importance of considering tourism as something occurring during many phases of tourism.

Future studies of tourism must therefore include multiple spaces and places within their epistemological boundaries, and consider these not as independent, fixed entities, but rather as always in relation to each other and, as Hetherington notes, constantly in the process of being placed in relation to each other (1997, p. 188). Space and place must become flexible, fluid referents for enunciations of touristic change. Such a framework will highlight the integration of tourism into individual mobilities, and recognize the way in which spaces and places are continually placed in relationships that create comparisons and recognitions of difference and touristic moments.

Interacting with mobile places

Whereas studies of tourism have been primarily concerned with the embodied mobilities of individuals, the texts of this study show that mobilities of virtual place also have a significant role within tourism. Spaces are important sites for physical interactions, but activities in space also create memories of place that, due to their mobility, can have an impact on interactions in many spaces. The intangible and virtual component of places, though often acknowledged as components of experience, have often been left out of discussions of place and place attachment (cf. Gustafson, 2006, p. 18). Intangible places, however, arise as important components of the narratives in this study, and individuals engage with them both while away from the spaces they are connected to, as well as while present in these spaces.

In MacGregor's memoir about cottaging in Ontario's Algonquin Park, he speaks of how the place of the cottage became a part of his life outside its physical space (2002). As a child, MacGregor sat in school dreaming of summer and of returning to nature at his grandparents' cottage:

> My notebooks were filled with intricate drawings of pond life, the drawings from mid-winter showing where the beaver and snapping turtles and leopard frogs were sleeping and waiting, just like me, for the coming release of summer. Away from my beloved point at Two Rivers, I would draw it endlessly, if poorly, through the long Canadian winter: the old ranger's hand-built log home sitting below the high pines, the three little clapboard cabins where our family slept and cooked from joyous school-out to dreaded school-in, the Union Jack snapping on the flag pole (and God be with the child that let it touch the ground when we lowered it each evening), the huge floating dock, usually with a large snapping turtle staring menacingly from under the log booms, the red cedar-strip canoe out on the water, the little wooden fishing boat heading off in the evenings when our father was home from the lumber mill, a small cloud of blue smoke rising from his old three-horsepower Evinrude, a small cloud of white smoke rising from the Players fine-cut roll-your-own smoke that hung from his mouth as if it had been nailed to the side of his upper lip, the glistening steel line from the trolling rod stretching far out behind in search of the lake trout that lay off the point. (MacGregor, 2002, p. viii)

While separated from this beloved space, MacGregor interacted with the place of his grandparents' cottage by recreating the details in his drawings and revisiting the memories of his experiences there. He actualizes these virtual memories, bringing them into a concrete form by drawing them. Though some information is lost in the translation from virtual to concrete form, drawing remains a meaningful practice for MacGregor that allows him to interact with this special place.

As an adult, MacGregor continues to escape to the place of the cottage while separated from it spatially. Rather than drawing, he uses photographs of his family's cottage to help his imagination travel, no matter where his work as a journalist takes him:

> A digital photograph of a small, rustic cottage – nothing, really, compared to the old ranger's magnificent log house – sitting on a deep cold lake on the western edge of Algonquin serves as the screen saver on the laptop computer that represents my office far more than any downtown building. And I can change the image to fit the mood – flying off to the Stanley cup playoffs with the view from the dock to escape into, flying off to the Olympics with the view of the deck where the hummingbirds come to feed, flying off to cover an election campaign with a lovely, sweeping twilight shot of the bay to turn to when the speeches begin to drag. (MacGregor, 2002, pp. viii-ix)

These photographs are representations of the place of MacGregor's cottage, and their creation contributed to the process of constructing a place of the cottage through the ordering and placing of material objects. For MacGregor, they become tools through which he can revisit the cottage and interact with the memories and emotions of this place as he travels through other spaces. The familiarity MacGregor has with his cottage is translated into a very strong relationship to it as a place – arranged, ordered, and named

through repeated experiences. Therefore, when his physical presence at the cottage is not possible, he can use material artifacts, what Latour refers to as immutable mobiles (cf. Hetherington, 1997; Latour, 1988), to experience the place of the cottage across space and time. Though winter weather may make the physical site of the cottage difficult to access, the place of the cottage is mobile and accessible year round (cf. MacGregor, 2005, p. 230).[xxviii] It can appear and be interacted with in anywhere, and is therefore used not only in the summer, but every day (MacGregor, 2005, p. 230):[xxix]

> It is what we use to get away, even when physically we cannot get away. It is where we go to escape, to dream, to plan, even to visit, thinking fondly of friends on the lake we have not seen since the previous summer, thinking of favourite places where we like to paddle shortly after dawn, the lake still steaming with the mysteries of the night. It is, as well, what we hold onto, our Linus's blanket, when things don't go quite as planned or hoped. (MacGregor, 2005, pp. 231-232)

The value of the cottage is thus not connected to its physical form: "No matter how it exists in reality, the summer place remains, for so many of us, our sweetest thought" (MacGregor, 2005, p. xvii). It is rather the place of the cottage that is important to hold onto during everyday life.[xxx]

In lieu of a physical trip to his cottage space, MacGregor is able to make a virtual trip to his cottage place. Such a trip can bring with it the pleasure associated with physical trips, and in this way serves as a touristic break from everyday life:

> We don't always need to be at the lake to enjoy it. I visit when I'm shovelling the driveway in February. I lie on the deck with a cold beer and a good mystery novel when I'm stuck in traffic. That's not me napping on the living-room couch, that's me at work, planning and organizing complicated summer projects, whacking down the undergrowth back of the outhouse, helping put in a new dock, finally locating that secret speckled-trout lake that supposedly lies somewhere back of the dam. We're talking year-round retreat, instant access. (MacGregor, 2002, p. ix)

Engaging with the place of the cottage is possible anywhere, and doing so becomes an escape from MacGregor's everyday spaces. These interactions contain significant contrasts between the space MacGregor inhabits, such as a snowy driveway in February, and the place of the cottage that he conjures. In this way these virtual trips actively engage with change and difference, and could be identified as intangible touristic practices of the everyday. There is a transit between the physical space and the virtual place that introduces a notable change. Since the primary home and second home are spatialized differently and marked as unique places, "physical and mental transitions . . . occur in movement between the two places" (Periäinen, 2006, p. 110). Though often these physical and mental transitions occur simultaneously, I suggest that it is also worth considering how virtual trips to second home places mark an important mental transition, and possibly an intangible engagement with touristic change. The place of the cottage functions as an important escape and a brief vacation from the spaces of MacGregor's everyday life, and simultaneously builds touristic anticipation for future physical visits.

Intangible places are also a key component of practices in and around the space of the cottage. MacGregor's narrative of the search for Ermine Lake, highlighted in the previous

chapter, involves significant interactions with place. The search for Ermine Lake consists not only of three journeys through the bush, but also the research, storytelling, and planning undertaken at Roy and John's second and primary homes. Indeed, a very small part of the work of creating a place of Ermine Lake is accomplished at the lake itself. Roy and John begin to order a place of Ermine Lake through naming the lake and setting it apart from other places when they interact with their topographical maps and note its unique isolation and unexplored islands. Even though they cannot yet interact with the space of the lake, they are able to order and imagine it with the aid of representations.

After failing on their first two searches, John and Roy's interactions with the place of Ermine Lake become a more central part of their story. Roy explains how they speak of the lake a great deal to both justify their failure and to paint a fanciful picture of the lake to justify their determination to reach it one day. This discussion of Ermine Lake is place-work, and through it the place of Ermine Lake, as an intangible yet well-defined entity, begins to become part of the awareness and mythology of their community of cottagers. Opportunities for pleasure become connected not only to actual physical trips to the lake, but also to intangible interactions and imaginations of it. Both this storytelling and the planning Roy and John do through email while at their primary homes in the winter help to create an imagined place of Ermine Lake, and this intangible place supports and encourages future attempts to find the lake. In this way, the place of Ermine Lake becomes a touristic attraction that can be interacted with long before it is experienced as a physical space. Though physically reaching the lake brings a moment of disappointment for Roy when he discovers that his long-enjoyed virtual place does not match with the physical space of the lake, exploring and discovering the heron colony leads him to re-order the lake's material components, and conclude that his updated image of the place of Ermine Lake will remain an active component of community legends. In this way, MacGregor's narrative about Ermine Lake reveals the rich complexity of intangible interactions with place that can become a central component of touristic mobilities.

Intangible place also holds an important place within return home mobilities, where interactions with mobile places are often alluded to in discussions of transnational activity. Practices such as attending cultural events like Chinese New Year celebrations or shopping at Chinese grocery stores, for example, can call upon and interact with the place of China or previous homes. In Phillips' narrative of her multi-decade relationship with China, she points to the interconnections between China and Canada, noting that not only were the events in China keenly followed by those outside the country, but on occasion those Canadians with connections to this place reacted to events in China by protesting or committing crimes (Phillips, 1990, pp. 40-41). Having spent the beginning of her life in Hong Kong, and then returned to southern China and Hong Kong as a young adult, Phillips has a strong connection to China and refers to both China and Canada as homes. During her childhood in Canada, Phillips' family kept close ties with the Chinese communities in each city they inhabited, and their connection to the place of China was also supported by a four-foot long picture of Hong Kong that was a fixture in their home (Phillips, 1990, p. 47). These interactions with communities and representations of the place of China point to a strong cultural connection between countries and they are easily explained using the frame of transnational activity. They can also be seen as an indication

of interactions with place over time and space. Immutable mobiles such as the picture of Hong Kong in Phillips' childhood home become objects through which intangible memories of place can be accessed. Transnational activity therefore involves interactions with mobile representations and memories of place.

These cases thus demonstrate the importance of interactions with mobile places, and suggest that virtual place can be connected to significant engagements with change. Whereas previous spatializations largely disregarded interactions with place, the memoirs in this study reveal rich engagements with place that affect the change experienced within touristic mobilities. For this reason, considerations of mobile place must be incorporated into further work on tourism and touristic engagements.

Tracing connections – situating touristic practices in mobilities of place and space

In addition to highlighting the importance of places, memoirs address the role many different spaces have in shaping touristic practices. Though home sites have long been acknowledged within studies of travel, the relationship between different spaces in travel mobilities has been more often characterized by straightforward comparisons than by considerations of connections or influences between spaces. The texts of this study illustrate that complex relationships exist between multiple spaces and places, and these relationships bring rich insights about touristic practices within return home and second home mobilities.

Mobilities and visiting the pandas

In Yee Chiang's narrative of his return visit to China, there are complex relationships between multiple spaces. These are seen primarily in the connection between experiences in spaces outside of China and subsequent touristic practices upon his return (1977). Returning to his home country after many years' absence, Chiang undertakes an itinerary that includes numerous spaces and sites in all parts of China. He visits many spaces on his trip, including factories and schools, in order to learn about the present state of the country he has been away from for many years. As well, Chiang takes the opportunity to visit tourism sites such as the Yunkang caves, which were long of interest to him, but had been eliminated from previous itineraries because of the dangers posed by poor roads and bandits (1977, pp. 70-72). Chiang also undertakes visits to his previous homes, which are discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Though Chiang has many different connections to the spaces on his journey, his visits to some spaces are particularly tied to his previous experiences outside of China. While in Peking (Beijing), Chiang visits the Zoological Gardens in order to see the giant panda bears. In his narrative, Chiang marks the connection between his previous exposure to panda bears and his current visit. This 'special animal of China', as he calls it, was discovered by accident and became a sought-after prize for game hunters (Chiang, 1977, p. 79). In 1938, after Chiang had left China, an American caught five live pandas, and sold them to zoos across Europe, including one in London:

> Since I was living in London at the time and this creature came from my country, I naturally went with the crowd [to visit the panda at the London Zoo]. At once it struck me that its black and white color scheme would be suitable for Chinese brush rendering. I decided to study it carefully and to sketch it in all poses for some Chinese-style paintings. As its stable diet is bamboo leaves and young stems, it is an ideal subject for a typical Chinese work. . . . Many Chinese painters in the past had painted all kinds of beasts and birds, but not this creature, for it was not known to them. So I became known as the first Chinese painter to have painted the giant panda. I also wrote two children's books called *Chinpao and the Giant Pandas* and *The Story of Ming*. . . . The London critics soon dubbed me the panda man." (Chiang, 1977, pp. 81-82)

Chiang's first visit to see the giant panda is deemed 'natural' because he was in London already and the animal came from 'his country'. The animal's connection to his place of home – China – is thus presented as a significant influence upon his practice of visiting and viewing it.

Once back in his home space, the chain of practices Chiang previously undertook connect back to his act of viewing a giant panda in Peking. Chiang, through a rhetorical question, makes this relationship explicit: "With all these connections in the past, how could I resist going to see the inspirer of some of my work while I was in Peking?" (1977, p. 84). His previous interactions with actual and imagined panda bears in spaces outside of China compel him to undertake a touristic visit to see them upon his return. Though the particular form of this influence is unclear, it is his intangible history with and memory of the pandas – painting them, writing books about them, and interacting with critics in London – that impacts his decision to visit the pandas in Peking.

Chiang's connection to the place of China encourages engagements with pandas in London that then contribute to his touristic visit to see them upon his return to China. Knowing about the previous practices in which Chiang has encountered pandas thickens our understanding of his practice of gazing upon them while in Peking. What could be taken as a relatively simplistic visit to a marked tourist attraction, the Zoological Gardens, thus becomes recognizable as a personally meaningful practice that is connected to the remnants of other practices undertaken in other spaces. A framework of multiple spaces and places is therefore a necessary step towards a deeper understanding of how complex personal mobilities affect practices of tourism.

Moving through Palladian places

Gable and Gable's second home narrative also illustrates complex relationships between multiple spaces and places (2005). The distance between the Gable's primary home in Atlanta and the Villa Cornaro in Italy, which they acquire as a second home, is substantial in geographic, cultural, and historical terms. Built by the famous architect Palladio, the Villa Cornaro proves not only a suitable second home, but also an active historical site, a challenging building to renovate, and a unique cultural gathering point. The Gables' text reveals this villa to be ordered not only as a second home place, but also as a Palladian one that is connected to the famous architect who designed it.[xxxi] Their

interaction with this Palladian place is connected to their experiences in many other spaces, and it leads them to undertake unique touristic mobilities near their second home.

Though the Villa Cornaro is the Gables' second home, their construction of it as a Palladian place receives more emphasis in their memoir. Throughout the text, Sally makes references to Palladio, thus demonstrating her comment that "Andrea Palladio is a constant presence in my thoughts when I am at Villa Cornaro" (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 175).[xxxii] She imagines details of the first meeting between Palladio and Giorgio Cornaro at the future site of the Villa Cornaro (Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 74-76), and wonders about how Palladio would react to her decorating: "I wonder how he would like the flowers I've just placed on the dining-room table. Would he approve of the furnishings we have? I know he'd like our kitchen!"(Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 175-176). In this way, Palladio appears as an intangible presence in the Gables' experiences of the space of their Villa. This presence is affective, and the Gables' beliefs about Palladio's reactions and opinions impact how they materially interact with the space during several waves of renovations.[xxxiii] After completing complex and costly renovations on the upstairs south portico, they are comforted because the project met their 'ultimate test': "Palladio would be pleased" (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 242). The Gables also choose to actively invest in the villa's history by researching Palladio and the Cornaro family and guiding tours through the villa. Palladio has an important connection to the space, and through their practices they construct and order the Villa Cornaro as not only a second home place, but also a Palladian place that is marked by representations and memories connected to Palladio and his designed spaces.[xxxiv]

This attachment to the Palladian place of their second home affects the Gables' mobilities. Their desire for further information about the historical and architectural context of their second home space leads them to instigate a touristic trip in which they can gaze upon and interact materially with other Palladian spaces. By so doing, they can also construct a more detailed representation of the place of a Palladian villa. Sometime after acquiring the Villa Cornaro as a second home, the Gables set off in a rental car on a sightseeing trip to visit and visually compare their villa with others Palladio designed. As Sally notes:

> We are trying to arrive at our own conception of where Villa Cornaro sits in this pantheon of Palladian icons. About eighteen Palladio-designed villas still stand in the Veneto, the number depending on how you count a few whose connection with Palladio is doubtful or where changes through the centuries are so great that little of Palladio is left. We decide that Barbaro, Emo, La Malcontenta, and La Rotonda, together with Cornaro, constitute a sort of "Big Five." They are all large villas designed (except La Rotonda) for wealthy Venetian patrons; they were built substantially the way Palladio designed them; and they have not suffered fundamental changes since. So these are the ones we set off to see first. We are on the lookout for the contrasts and similarities to our own villa. (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 83)

Before undertaking their tour, the Gables must evaluate the possible destinations and determine criteria that narrow down those worthy of a visit. The authenticity of the spaces seems to be an important guiding factor, and those that have been changed

substantially from the way Palladio first designed them are dismissed from the itinerary. After having narrowed it to what they label as the 'Big Five', they set off on a touristic extension of their second home mobility.[xxxv]

The trip is notable because it is centrally related to, and inspired by, the Gables' second home. Had they not already established and experienced their second home as a Palladian place, it is less likely this mobility to interact with other Palladian places would have been undertaken. The practices that arrange the place of a 'Palladian villa' in their second home therefore become important to understanding their touristic practices of gazing and touring at the other villas.

In a similar manner, the Gables' acquisition of the Villa Cornaro leads them to feel connected to the Cornaro family, for whom the villa was originally built, and this connection also affects their touristic mobilities. While reading an article in Atlanta, Sally notices the name of Christoph Cornaro, who is Austria's ambassador to the Vatican (see Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 153-160). Curious about the potential connection to the Cornaro family of their villa, Carl writes a letter to the ambassador. It turns out the ambassador is indeed a relative of their Cornaros and, having established a personal connection, the Gables offer to host Christoph and his wife Gail at the Villa Cornaro. After accepting this invitation, the Cornaros reciprocate, and Sally and Carl embark upon a touristic trip to the Cornaros' home in Rome.

The Gables' trip to Rome not only comes as a result of their connection to a former space of the Cornaro family, but also becomes filled with visits to other sites that are connected to the family. The highlight of the tour of Rome is a trip to the Cornaro Chapel, within the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria. The church is closed for restoration, but Christoph arranges a private tour, during which they are able to converse with the chief restorer and even touch some of the original artifacts. Within their memoir, this visit to Rome is narrated in considerable detail, and holds a place of notable importance. Their visit, however, would not likely have happened had it not been for Christoph, whom they met by virtue of their connection to and interest in the Villa Cornaro, their second home.

In this way, connections to spaces and places can profoundly affect the practices and touristic mobilities individuals undertake. As the Gable's case shows, primary homes are not centrally important to some mobilities. Their trip to visit Palladio's villas has little relationship to their primary home, but is inseparable from their experiences at their second home. In this way, for some touristic mobilities home is not as important, and this opens up space to consider how tourism can be related to other spaces and places. An understanding of the relationship between places and touristic practices enhances our understanding of the act and role of touristic gazing within larger mobilities, and illustrates the importance of considering how connections between spaces and places can affect touristic consumption.

Connections to place and changing experiences at/of home

In addition to affecting touristic practices and mobilities, connections to second home places or previous home places can have a significant affect upon experiences at primary homes. That is, these spaces and places exist within interactive relationships that demonstrate the mutual construction and the relational experience of multiple homes and multiple spaces/places.

Leaving primary residences and establishing connections to other spaces and places can lead individuals to undertake unique activities upon their return. That is, just as the connections to a place or space can contribute to decisions to undertake touristic mobilities, so can they inspire touristic activities of the everyday within familiar spaces. One example of such a situation would be when individuals discover a love for new types of food or alcohol while visiting foreign countries and then search them out in unfamiliar neighborhoods and restaurants upon returning to their primary residence. In this way, tourism can both engage with comparisons of pre-existing changes and affect changes within familiar spaces of home.

In addition to being connected to segments of touristic mobility, the Gables' experiences in their second home inspire unique touristic practices undertaken while residing at their primary home. Undertaking travel to their second home influences what can be seen as tourism of the everyday when they travel to Atlanta. Within the Gables' repetitive mobilities between the Villa Cornaro in Italy and their primary home in Atlanta, experiences and tasks overlap. Thus, practices oriented to projects or goals at their second home are often undertaken in spaces in and around their primary home. After their first visit to, and departure from, the villa, Sally discusses plans for their winter in Atlanta:

> We just carry [back to Atlanta] surreal memories and a determination to spend the winter learning more about the mansion/barn that has joined our lives like a moose at a picnic. I realize that I've associated myself with a long chain of history, but it is a history I don't know, about people I never heard of, events I've never read about, and influences on the modern world that I never knew existed. (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 31)

Sally notes a perceptible gap in knowledge about their new space, and since this gap is not desirable, they set out to find resources that will help to fill it. This practice of acquiring knowledge is very deliberate: "The villa is a great cache of secrets, and I intend to pry out each one" (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 33). While in Atlanta and away from the second home then, Sally proceeds to do research – a practice connected to her second home that ostensibly would not be undertaken in her primary home were it not for the presence of this other space.

When it comes time to renovate the kitchen at the Villa Cornaro, Sally again undertakes reading and research in Atlanta. Indeed, after noting that they always knew a kitchen renovation would be required, she asserts: "During the winter in Atlanta I begin by roving the aisles of Barnes & Noble" (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 53). The missing noun in this sentence, the 'what' of her beginning, can be read as 'the renovation' of her

second home kitchen. Again, Atlanta becomes the site for practices that are undertaken as a result of the existence of, and past and future interactions with, their second home.

The examples of these interconnected practices abound. While first furnishing the villa, Sally's quest for appropriate Chinese deco rugs begins in Italy, but is continued in Atlanta when she discovers very high prices at Italian stores (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 134). She ends up buying "five or six over a period of three years" and then transporting them to Italy by air freight (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 134). As well, after discovering a considerable genealogical volume on the Cornaro family, the Gables decide to organize its information, and Carl begins imputing information into a genealogical program on his computer in Atlanta (Gable and Gable, 2005, p. 92). This activity takes up a substantial amount of his time, and is again an activity that would be unlikely to occur were it not for their connection to a particularly unique second home. These practices are significant not only because they highlight how a context of multiple spaces adds depth to understandings of particular practices, but also because they suggest how connections to one space can encourage practices that are exceptional or unusual in another space. Though some of these practices may resemble everyday practices, depending on the Gable's normal activities in Atlanta, they also retain the unique quality of being oriented towards an absent place and space. Thus, while visiting the library or Barnes & Noble might be an everyday activity, looking for books in the history, architecture, or renovation section could be quite unusual, and furthermore is infused with a sense of change because of the transit and mobility from the second home space that instigated the search for books. In this way, practices such as researching, shopping, and cataloguing become infused with touristic novelty or change, despite their occurrence within everyday spaces.

Mukherjee's narrative of her return trip to India also highlights the way in which travel can involve changes in home, although in her case this change comes primarily as new evaluations of her homes. Returning home leads Mukherjee to not only re-engage with negotiations between spaces and place of India, which will be further developed in the following section, but also with those of her present home in Canada. Due to her contested status as a native and a foreigner, a local and a visitor, Mukherjee attaches herself to friends, old and new, and spends a significant portion of her return trip following the rhythm of their everyday lives. Her home in Canada is a point of reference for this experience, but in addition to reinterpreting India in light of Canada, her time following Indian friends prompts her to reinterpret her life in Canada:

> Over the months as I tagged along with them [her friends] and followed the daily structure of their lives, I felt an accumulating embarrassment about the self-absorption of my own life in Montreal. I worked with no charities, had no connection with neighbors, or with ethnic and professional groups. Depression and joy were limited to promotion and tenure, acceptance or rejection of manuscripts. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 203)

This re-evaluation of her primary home through travel is indicative of another blank spot within studies of tourism. As much as tourism establishes exceptionality and change with reference to home, it also re-establishes home through engagements with change and exceptionality. Thus, these interactions between past and present spaces and places

suggest that the space and place of India are significant influences upon her understandings of travel mobility as well as her experience in her current home. Although Mukherjee's text does not share insights about whether or not these new interpretations of her life in Canada affect her practices upon her return, this re-engagement with the meaning of her everyday life in Montreal provides an opportunity that could encourage engagements with novelty and change upon her return.

Just as connections to many spaces and places can influence touristic practices and mobilities, so too can touristic practices and mobilities influence the instigation of new activities within areas of usual residence. These spaces and places are fundamentally connected and mutually affective, created in relationship to each other. In particular, the next section considers the mobile construction of place and the network in which spatialization occurs.

Mobile constructions of place, networks and nodes of spatialization

Practices, spaces, and places are not only very interconnected, but also involved in mobile constructions of place and interacting spatializations. The mobile construction of place was highlighted above in the discussion of MacGregor's search for Ermine Lake, and can also be seen in Gable and Gable and Mukherjee's narratives. The Gables interact with the materiality of the Villa Cornaro, and in so doing create order and representations that establish it as a second home place that is simultaneously a Palladian place, and a Cornaro place. Their work of placing and ordering elements is not limited to the villa though. Their trips to other Palladian villas allow them to construct further details about where Palladian places stand in comparison to others.[xxxvi] In Atlanta, they also undertake practices, such as research, shopping and the computerizing of family trees, which interact with and contribute to the place of their second home. Similarly, Mukherjee's touring of her friends' lives in India leads her to relate her everyday life to new referent points. Compared to her friends' lives, which include generous interactions with community, her practices in Montreal appear self-absorbed, and as a result the place of Montreal takes on a new set of emotional cues. As Hetherington notes, places exist in similitude (1997, pp. 187-188), and so travel mobilities become ideal opportunities for place-work and the putting of places into new relationships of difference.

On a societal level, this process can be understood as the interacting spatialization of multiple spaces. Though places are often grounded in one physical location, such as a built house, organizing and arranging the intangible structure of a place can be accomplished outside of this space. Indeed, comparing places to other places and thereby establishing differences can, on a more collective level, be likened to spatializations of two or more contrasting nodes. Just as leaving home allows individuals to enunciate what home is in relation to other spaces, so multiple homes, or primary and second homes, can become nodes that enunciate relationships of difference, but not necessarily opposition: "primary and second home exist in a dialectical relationship in which the meanings of both are created by, and bound up with, each other. Primary and second homes are not therefore polar opposites, but rather they represent a continuum of experience"(Perkins and Thorns, 2006, p. 79). The homes in this study thus exist in relationship to each other,

as well as to many other spaces. It is, for example, the Gables' trip to see other Palladian villas that allows them to better spatialize their own villa within a historical and architectural context. In this way, spatializations are never the product of interactions in a single space, but rather incorporate the relationships spaces have to each other, and the way different spaces act as nodes in a vast network of spatializations.

Not only the multiple homes in this study, but also the mobile spaces of transit in between them are important parts of spatializing various types of homes. The connection between the Gables' two homes marked by the purchasing of Chinese rugs is established by virtue of the mobile spaces of transit and air freight that also function as nodes within spatializations. In this way, the relationships between pairs of spaces and places can and must be extended to consider the impact of larger networks of space and place.[xxxvii] Space and place, rather than being fenced off as isolated objects of study, must be situated within a context of interactive mobilities and acknowledged as fundamentally interconnected and affective components of experience.

Conclusion

This chapter outlines support for a transition from notions of tourism that are based on measuring change between acceptable spaces that are locked in fixed relationships with each other to ones that acknowledge the importance of virtual place and the way in which multiple spaces and places within mobilities are profoundly affective. Experiences in space or with place are not isolated, but rather are formed in relation to other spaces and places, and in turn affect future practices and experiences. The examples from Chiang and Gable and Gable's memoirs illustrate insights about this connected and interrelated framework of spaces and places that do not fit within former spatializations of tourism. That is, were we to concentrate only on a circular trip from a primary home, the importance of interactions in London to Chiang's visiting of the Zoo in Peking would be lost, and the Gables' visit of other Palladian villas would remain disconnected from the motivation that their ownership of the Villa Cornaro provides. These touristic activities are connected to multiple spaces and places, and understandings of them remain partial without acknowledging and examining this complex network.

Though an awareness of the interactive multiplicities of space and place is not consistent in the memoirs of this study, portions of the second home and return home memoirs acknowledge the importance of these connections. When separated from important spaces, individuals can take virtual trips to visit places with the help of immutable mobiles. Such practices both build anticipation for future physical trips and represent intangible engagements with change.

Furthermore, touristic visits to gaze upon attractions can involve complex personal histories that incorporate other spaces, places and practices. Connections to particular places can also lead to touristic practices in everyday spaces, and in this way temporarily occupied spaces and places can affect interactions in regularly occupied ones. That is, tourism away from home can lead to tourism at home. Interconnections between spaces and places can spark touristic trips within second home mobilities, as well as influencing

practices undertaken at primary homes. As Fridgen has pointed out, travel can be related to "a continuing exploration of trip-related events and activities after the return home. . . . following a trip, people may continue to explore events and activities in their home community that are similar to those encountered or undertaken during travel" (1984, p. 32). Touristic interactions in distant spaces can thus encourage and directly relate to new investigations and interactions within areas of usual residence. These relationships and the affectivity of spaces and places within individuals' mobilities must therefore be taken into account when discussing tourism.

Tourism, in this context, is marked by not only the integration of change introduced in the transit between or within spaces, but also by the change that transit between different locations can influence in subsequent activities. Experiences in one space can change attitudes or preferences or goals, and thus inspire a change in practices after leaving the space. In this way, different spaces and places within mobilities are seen to be interconnected and mutually affective.

The connection and multiplicity of spaces and places is supported by the spatialization of homes within the texts of this study. Within the memoirs of this study, home is spatialized in many different ways, but two important themes that surface are the spatialization of multiple homes and the establishment of these spaces as meaningful in relation to each other. Within both return home and second home memoirs, authors name multiple spaces and places of home.

Though this might seem unsurprising in the case of migrants returning home, in Chiang's memoir the mention of multiple homes comes in a somewhat surprising form. Though Chiang discusses the periods he spends living in England and the United States, he does not call either location 'home', referring rather to built structures, such as the house "where I had lived for several years" (1977, p. 40) or legal designations: "After having taught in Columbia for a number of years and finally becoming a permanent member of the staff, my future in the United States seemed to be assured, so I became an American citizen" (1977, p. 49). Chiang talks, however, extensively about his 'homeland' of China, and it is within this homeland that he allows homes to exist in multiplicity – as many home cities (1977, p. 119). Though Chiang does not claim a home outside his country of birth, Phillips names Hong Kong, China, and Canada as homes (see Chapter 4), and Mukherjee calls both India and Canada 'homeland' (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 175). These multiple spaces and places become intertwined in experiences of dwelling and return, as the previous chapters have outlined.

Second home memoirs also name and spatialized numerous homes. Gable and Gable frame their second home, Italy, Atlanta, and Venice as homes that are very much interconnected in their experience. MacGregor also addresses many significant homes, including his childhood home in Whitney, Ontario, his grandparents' cottage at Two Rivers, his home in Ottawa, and his present cottage on Camp Lake. These different homes are marked by many different components, including physical and relational ones – as evidenced by lamentations of the incursion of technological "conveniences of home" upon the cottage (MacGregor, 2002) and Sally Gable's assertion that she has "a new

home among the women of Piombino Dese" (Gable and Gable, 2005). Home is also connected to performance codes of mobility, and in MacGregor's context of 'escape', home is constructed as a place you are eager to return to, a space spatialized into a process of coming and going. These spatializations affirm the need to consider homes as multiple, and as created and valued through mobility.[xxxviii]

The operations of interconnected spaces and places of home are further examined in the following chapter. It is argued that mobilities shared by family members can include strikingly different experiences, and thus prevent the labeling of mobilities as fundamentally directed towards or consumed with tourism. Rather, touristic moments and practices enter into many different mobilities. Mobilities that re-engage with previously known homes are examined more closely, and it is argued that returning to a familiar space to engage with an established place of home demands work of 're-placing', incorporating the changes that emerged through transit and mobility. These embodied engagements with place form central motivations for certain return home mobilities, and in all cases involve work to re-organize the materiality and emotions of current experiences in places and spaces that were previously known. The chapter concludes with a methodological vision for future studies of tourism that includes an interacting web of multiple spaces and places.

Chapter Five – Interactions and intersections of tourism and home

This chapter elaborates upon the context of virtual places and interacting relationships between space, place, and practices outlined in the previous chapter. A closer look at return home mobilities highlights the different ways change is manifest in touristic mobilities.

Firstly, shared familial mobilities can include interactions within other people's homes, as well as striking differences in experience. Families may travel together, but this does not necessarily translate into similar experiences, especially when some members are revisiting previous homes and others are not. Mobilities cannot be discussed then as fundamentally about tourism, as experiences of tourism and home can appear and disappear, even over the course of one small segment of mobility.

Having drawn attention to the presence of similarity and change, tourism and home, within mobilities, this chapter then turns to a consideration of returning home. Often, engaging with changes in familiar spaces is a central motivation for return home mobilities. These engagements are presented as a type of place-work, in which the changes introduced through transit must be incorporated into new understandings of familiar places. That is, upon return individuals must materially engage with spaces, and by so doing 're-place' and 're-order' their constructions of place, as well as the emotional cues that go with them.

In light of these engagements with spaces that are familiar yet changed, because of the transit from and through other spaces and places, the chapter concludes by arguing for a new methodological focus that situates tourism within a network of spaces and places. In addition to multiplying the number of sites that are deemed relevant to an understanding of tourism, we should also consider the virtual places that can become central components of touristic practices and mobilities. These places can become mobile referents for marking out place comparisons and observing and integrating the changes brought about through mobility and transit.

Touring others' lives

As argued in the introduction, tourism and home have long been spatialized and understood as opposites. As such, tourism could never occur at home. After acknowledging that the touristic can consist of changes within spaces, however, opportunities open up for recognizing tourism of homes and for touring others' lives.

Blaise and Mukherjee's mobility to India in their memoir *Days and Nights in Calcutta* (1977) illustrates touristic engagements both between and within spaces. This change is facilitated and constrained by their physical presence in others' homes. Both professors at Canadian universities, Clark Blaise and Bharati Mukherjee return from work one day to find their home, and nearly all of their possessions, have been destroyed in an accidental fire. Shortly thereafter, Bharati is involved in a serious car accident, and this additional trauma prompts them to take their children and leave the country to spend a year in India

visiting Bharati's family and former homes. The story of this year away from their primary home is presented twice – first from Clark's point of view and then from Bharati's.

Though Bharati has an intimate knowledge of many of the locations they visit, Clark has only been in India a few times, and remains in many ways an outsider. As a result, Clark's narrative speaks to his experience as a white male who has been adopted into Bharati's Indian family. His passages are often richly descriptive and indicative of an iconic touristic experience – outlining the details of locations they visit or his discomfort when encountering complex familial prescriptions or unwanted attention from locals. Clark's musings about Indian culture, and the lack of conflict between mysticism and rationalism, further demonstrate how his experience in India is marked by comparisons between what he knows of Canadian life and culture and the culture and expectations he finds in India. This enunciation of gaze and comparisons to a distant primary home are consistent with many existing understandings of the tourist role, and help to construct Clark as a semi-detached outsider within India.

Clark's narrative contrasts starkly with Bharati's very personal account of the negotiation involved in her return home. Returning home is a strange experience for Bharati because of her dual status as a native and a visitor.[xxxix] The spaces she visits are both previous homes and spaces for vacation, and this contradiction leads Bharati to attach herself to old and new friends, becoming "absorbed into the daily texture of other people's lives" (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 199). Over time, this practice makes Bharati aware of the differences between her life in Montreal and the lives of her friends (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 203). Being like a tourist and examining the banalities of others' lives brings Bharati to feel that her life in Montreal is self-absorbed in comparison. Touring the lives of her friends thus leads her to compare her primary home to India, and this comparison, which is a reversal of the type Clark demonstrates, brings a new perspective to her own life.

Both Clark and Bharati actively engage with change during their time in India, but this change is enunciated in comparison to different spaces and places. Thus, their experiences of tourism can be qualitatively different, even when they undertake similar practices.

In addition to Bharati's touring of her friends' lives, she and Clark both spend substantial time engaged in her parents' home and lives. For a portion of their trip, Bharati, Clark, and their two children live with her parents in a suburb outside of Bombay. During this time, they learn about and practice the particularities of Bharati's parents' routines. For Clark, even activities such as shopping hold substantial appeal:

> It takes a couple of hours every day to shop for the day's several meals, and even in the 100° heat and its unchanging rituals, shopping exercised an attraction for me. I could lose myself with Bharati and Mommy-di [his mother-in-law], learning slowly to appreciate the shrewdness of judgment, the elaborate seductiveness that must have been part of all commerce, in the beginning. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 21)

Though this time spent engaging with the change of their relatives' lives can reveal poignant revelations, it also holds significant challenges. Bharati's father often acts as an obstacle to their mobility, and despite Bharati's protests, he uses the price of gasoline and the danger of violence as reasons to prevent trips outside the house (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 283). Thus, familial roles and obligations become constraints upon Bharati and Clark's leisure and mobility.

After awhile, Clark notes that the repetition of this daily life became tedious: "It wears you down, daily life that has a ritual sameness, when the ritual isn't yours" (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 39). As a result, they decide to take a vacation from their vacation, visiting luxurious tourist accommodations including the Sheraton-Oberoi in Nariman Point and the Taj Mahal in Bombay (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 42). When they finally leave Bombay for good, it is a welcomed change (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 52), due to their desire for more control over their own mobility.

The existence of India as Mukherjee's previous home is thus linked to a set of obligations that extend over her social networks there. These obligations both facilitate touristic engagements with the lives of friends and families, and constrain their freedom to undertake other practices. Though mobilities to previous or second homes have much touristic potential, they also, like many other spaces, hold significant obstacles to the free pursuit of touristic or everyday practices. Considerations of tourism within mobilities must acknowledge each in turn. The next section thus briefly considers some of the ways these insights impact future efforts to label mobilities.

Labeling mobilities

As these negotiations of home suggest, mobilities actively engage with the creation and re-creation of relationships to place and space. In light of this negotiation, it becomes difficult to assess the relationship between tourism and mobilities. Mobilizing the reference points for tourism by creating space for touristic changes within spaces, and letting go of the necessity for circular tourist trips, leaves the labeling of tourism mobilities profoundly problematic. After all, touristic mobilities can no longer be identified by circular patterns of displacement, and notions of the touristic have changed so that very widespread mobility is no longer a necessary precondition. Furthermore, we can acknowledge that mobilities are made up of many practices that are both touristic and everyday. Thus, while possibilities for touristic practices exist throughout mobilities, labeling a segment of mobility as touristic can eclipse these particularities.

In the case of Blaise and Mukherjee, undertaking a trip as a family leads to a complex mix between visiting relatives, visiting tourist attractions, and even taking a vacation to a tourist resort in order to get away from relatives (1977, p. 42). Furthermore, they visit India in search not only of interactions with family and relaxation at luxury resorts, but also opportunities for productive work – as indicated by Clark's interaction with intellectuals and his desire to become familiar with India in order to set a novel there (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, pp. 85-92, 137). These diverse components illustrate the

complex matrix of home and tourist spaces, places, and practices that are intertwined within their mobility, which make assessments of its touristic quality difficult.

Other texts of this study similarly show that return home and second home mobilities are not homogenous phenomena. Many incorporate both practices and trips connected to familiarity and family as well as those that are more explicitly for leisure or tourism. Chiang, Bainbridge, and Liu all address mobilities that cover a multitude of home and not-home places (Bainbridge, 2002; Chiang, 1977; Liu, 2005, pp. 167-168). Other authors, like Blaise and Mukherjee, note the need to go on vacations from their vacations: MacGregor travels up the Crow River to get a break from his cottage (2002), Bainbridge takes a trip to break up a period of family gatherings (2002, p. 183), the Gables take trips to Venice (2005), and Chiang has periods of leisure travel placed throughout his trip home to China (1977). These mobilities thus incorporate diverse spaces, motivations and interactions.

Just as touristic change can be found within familiar spaces, so too is familiarity a part of exotic tourist locals. Many individuals undertake repetitive journeys to tropical resorts or favourite cities, and these mobilities can involve the development of routines, such as always eating at the same restaurants. Similarly, tourist practices can be repeated over the course of mobilities, such as when individuals walk through gardens in every city they visit. Traditional tourist vacations and mobilities to familiar locations are thus both marked by interactions with familiarity and change. The particular form of these interactions is an important concern for future studies.

In light of this heterogeneity, there is a danger in considering mobilities to be, in essence, touristic. Such a label can mask the combination of familiarity and change, touristic practices and non-touristic ones that characterize mobilities. Much of the existing tourist literature, by considering the connection between tourist practices and tourist spaces, has fallen to describing tourists and tourist practices by virtue of identifying tourist movement and voyages.[xl] In order to remain open to the possibilities for familiarity and exceptionality, for the everyday and the touristic in all mobilities, any assessments of the touristic orientation of mobilities are best made alongside qualifications of the heterogeneity inherent within them.

Having established the possibility for mobilities to engage with tourism and home, familiarity and change, the next section considers in more detail the unique situation of touristic mobilities that re-engage with familiar spaces and places. Rather than simply observing changes in space, it is argued that changes are introduced through transit and must become integrated into personal experience through the embodied 're-placing' of familiar places.

Revisiting places over passages of time – incorporating the changes of transit

Though places can be interacted with in many spaces, there is a particular value to embodied, sensual experiences. Visiting the intangible place of second or previous homes can also create a significant desire to physically visit these spaces, as in MacGregor's

experiences highlighted at the beginning of Chapter Four. Though individuals often continue to interact with the place of previous or second homes through photographs, television, newspaper stories, and conversations with those left behind, these practices all remain mediated.[xli] As such, they lack not only many elements of sensual, physical experience that would be possible with firsthand experience, but also any guarantee of the authenticity or completeness of their messages. The opportunity to interact in a personal, embodied way with the space and materiality of a second home, previous home, or previous country can therefore be very appealing.

Return visits thus often involve touristic engagements with change within spaces, not only in terms of observing change, but also in the active engagement through which individuals "re -place" places by re-arranging and re-ordering material objects to represent a space, and experiences in it, anew. This work serves to integrate the change introduced by transit into familiar places. The experience of changing places over time is a widespread phenomenon, and one that is in some ways guaranteed by mobilities. Within Perniola's notion of transit, transit itself introduces the differences between similar spaces (2001). People's mobility away from previous homes introduces difference that they then incorporate into experiences of this home upon their return. These patterns of mobility are transitions from the same to the same, in that certain spaces are still/always known as home places, and yet they are not equal but rather incorporate the differences emergent in transit. This suggests the interaction and mutual affectivity of spaces, in that transit brings in differences that then must be incorporated into changed understandings of sameness.[xlii] That is, transit from home introduces difference that is re-integrated into the place of home upon return. Re-visiting familiar spaces then requires engagements to 're-place' and integrate understandings of change into the ordered and arranged comparisons of place.

As noted in Chapter Two, a desire to keep track of change can be a prime motivation for return trips to previous homes. Physical trips of return, unlike engagements with place or immutable mobiles, allow for a full sensory experience while reestablishing the connection between space and place (Long, 2004, p. 88). According to Yi-Fu Tuan, places are tied into valuations, and they give space a specific intangible personality (1977). "Place is an organized world of meaning. It is essentially a static concept. If we see the world as process, constantly changing, we should not be able to develop any sense of place" (Tuan, 1977). Places then are created and experienced, according to Tuan, in pauses. Though this view of the creation of place differs from Hetherington's, Tuan's insights suggest why it is that return trips are valuable for re-placing.[xliii] His formulation of place as pause highlights the mobility of individuals and emphasizes the importance of embodied experiences of place.[xliv] If the place of home or homeland is created through pauses in experience, when change is momentarily organized into meaningful systems, then being separated from spaces prevents direct experiences that support, or revise notions of place. This argument is based on a privileging of physical experiences in space, and contrary to this project, an assertion of the immobility of place. Nonetheless, Tuan highlights the importance of physical experiences of pause that engage the senses, and especially the visual sense that he sees as central to the creation of place, to creating and engaging with the meaning and value of places.

There is then a frustration or trauma that exists in situations where physical interaction with place is desired but not obtainable. In this way, interactions with immaterial place and successful or impossible interactions with materially experienced pauses in space are important components of experience, not only for those privileged enough to embark upon mobilities to second homes or previous homes, but for all individuals.

The authors in this study's memoirs pause and engage sensually with places of importance to them, and by so doing incorporate and re-order changes that have been introduced through mobility. Through their pauses they re-organize the meaning of places to which they have maintained affective ties even during their absence. Chiang's return to China is marked by a significant desire to engage with changes within his homeland. The many stops along his trip allow him to tour through familiar spaces and unfamiliar ones, amassing experiences that help him to personally update and revise his understandings of place. In the prologue, he speaks of how engaging with change is a central focus of his return:

> I had been absent from China for forty-two years, nearly half a century. Half a century is a long time. During those forty-two years I had seen many changes taking place in England and America. The changes that had taken place in China since 1933 could have been even greater. I was so anxious and curious to learn about these great changes that I read whatever accounts I could get hold of in the daily papers and also in books written by people who had recently made visits to China. But a Chinese popular saying, 'Seeing once is better than hearing about it a hundred times,' kept telling me that I must go to see the changes myself. (Chiang, 1977, pp. 13-14)

Though not speaking of place as it is used in this study, Chiang emphasizes the importance of personally being in the space of his former country to see it for himself. On his return trip, comparisons between the places he knew in the past and the spaces he will encounter in the present seem to him inevitable:

> My thirty years of life in China before 1933 as well as my personal experiences as the head civil servant of three big counties put me into a rather different category as a visitor to the present-day China. I would undoubtedly compare what I could see now in China with what I knew of her before 1933. (Chiang, 1977, p. 54)

Unlike other visitors, Chiang's touring is marked by the observation of changes within spaces, and these comparisons between the current state of China and the virtual place he carries with him form the basis of place-work. Confronted by new built spaces and new experiences, as well as new understandings gained from the spaces and mobilities he has experienced since his departure, Chiang must re-arrange and re-order the place of China that he has carried with him during his absence. Chiang's practices during his return thus help to enunciate a revised understanding of the place of China by adding additional layers of meaning and additional memories from his new experiences in space.

During Chiang's return to China, he is always accompanied by guides from the Chinese Travel Service, whose job it is to facilitate all his trips to tourist attractions, as well as locating and arranging meetings with former friends he wishes to see. The assistance of the CTS guides helps to attribute a touristic element to all of his destinations, even those that hold primarily personal appeal. With the help of the CTS guides, Chiang actively

searches out familiar spaces along his journey, so that he can return to re-experience and re-place places that are entrenched in his memory. In Nanking, where he went to University, Chiang visits the Tai-ping-tien-kuo Memorial Hall, which has been erected on the Yu-hua-tai, the Terrace of Flowering Rain. As a student, Chiang once searched for unusual pebbles on this terrace (Chiang, 1977, p. 105). The terrace has changed significantly in its physical form, but Chiang also searches for a particular ancient tree that is cemented as a place in his memory, and finds it largely unchanged:

> In my student years I had spent many hours walking round and about a particular ancient tree, said to have been planted in the fourth century A.D. I wanted to see if it was still flourishing. Yang Shu-tien, Chu Chuan-chih, from the local China Travel Service, and I eventually found the liu-chao-sung, or "pine of the six-dynasties period," still alive and looking much as it had in my university days. (Chiang, 1977, p. 106)

When in his home city of Kiukang, Chiang similarly tries to revisit places that hold important memories from his past, but finds in several cases that the passage of time has made this impossible:[xlv]

> After the meal, Kuo Chi-fu and Feng Yen-ling drove Yang Shu-tien and me around the city. Every inch reminded me of something, yet everything looked so different from what I had known before. I insisted on being taken to where my old home had been, but there was no trace of it, or of my old official residence, for both had been destroyed by the Japanese invaders in 1938. I gazed at the stones on the road and the walls of the new houses, and could find no thought or words to describe my feelings. Everything told me that my past had gone forever. (Chiang, 1977, p. 130)

Though this disappearance of the past may be true in terms of his former home, Chiang is able to revisit Lu Mountain, a well-loved retreat from his past (1977, p. 133). As he spends two days visiting both beautiful locations that he frequented in the past and those he knew only through paintings, Chiang recalls and interacts with his memories of the place, such as watching sunrises on the mountain with his father, and with stories of buildings that were lost in lightening storms. Visiting Lu Mountain thus becomes an exercise in which Chiang interacts with places of the past and creates a new understanding of place that incorporates new knowledge and experiences. As a tourist attraction, Lu Mountain is marked as different from others, and though Chiang has visited it repeatedly during periods of his life, changes during his long absence make his return visit full of novelty and touristic difference.

Attempts to revisit familiar places from the past can thus invoke a multitude of emotions as the discrepancies between intangible places and the reality of present spaces become apparent. These experiences with the materiality of current spaces are practices that re-arrange and re-order previous understandings of space, creating new layers of memories and a sense of how the places of past experience are set apart from the current place of China. Such experiences are touristic in the way they engage with change and novelty, but in some cases are also located in spaces that are marked as tourist attractions within the tourist industry. Bainbridge visits the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Hall in Guangzhou, which is a notable local attraction, but this visit is a more meaningful engagement with change for him because his wife Starry's grandfather designed the building (2002, p.

165). Similarly, the Peak in Hong Kong is both a touristic landmark and a personal landmark for Phillips because her father once worked on the tram's electrics and told stories of the tram ride (1990, p. 48). Such examples illustrate the possibilities for diverse relationships between the tourist industry and touristic engagements with personally meaningful spaces and places. Whether deemed attractions by others or not, spaces that hold a personal connection are important sites for engaging with touristic change within spaces and re-connecting to and re-defining place in mobilities of return.

Mukherjee similarly observes changes within the space of India as she re-explores the spaces and places of her youth and updates her knowledge about familiar places. In these explorations, a lack of change is as interesting as change itself, as when Mukherjee notes that despite years of changing political situations, the block she grew up on in Calcutta remains the same (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 172). Revisiting some spaces or encountering particular objects provokes nostalgic or uncomfortable memories of the places and experiences of her youth, such as when she revisits her childhood bedroom:

> As a child I had thought privacy was possible only if one could scout out and stake claims on secretive spots behind heavy furniture or dusty curtains. In the flat on Rash Behari Avenue, my favorite hide-out had been between the parental four-poster and a chalky green wall with barred windows. One of the bars had been twisted slightly apart by (we suspected) a timid burglar, and cast crooked striped shadows on my bare legs. So when Clark and I, at my uncle's request, visited the room where I had spent the first eight years of my life, I saw superimposed on that uncluttered and recently painted bedroom wall the image of a wavy-haired, narrow-shouldered child crouching under the barred window, her skin powdery with green paint. But even as a child in that sun-striped room I had moved from the literal to the metaphoric in my pursuit of privacy. Survival from too much love: That was what privacy meant to me. But in middle-class India, to escape love is practically impossible; however disastrous, however murderous, it is still love. And I had survived by becoming a compulsive reader and by inducing sick headaches. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 222)

Revisiting this space that was an important part of her past prompts a recollection of the place, as she understood it – a prison of love. This passage demonstrates the way place can affect experiences of space, in this case by invoking the image of Mukherjee as a child in the room. It also shows the way that experiences outside a particular space can transform understandings of place and incorporate new insights about childhood relationships and the role practices such as reading have in forging a place marked by privacy.

Mukherjee's return trip to India allows her to revise her understanding of the places that are integral to her past. Having undertaken much re-placing, the places and memories she arrived with are not those she carries on her departure:

> I had come carrying a childish memory of wonder and promise, unsoiled by summer visits to my parents, of the mood of Independence Day, 1947. Now, on the eve of my return to Canada, I was an irritable adult who sensed in the procession of postures at the post offices, railway stations, restaurants, races,

> factories, and middle-class living rooms, crushing dismay and cynicism. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 285)

Through her travels, Mukherjee re-orders and re-names her relationships to places of India, and incorporate insights that her childhood maturity did not allow, along with observations about the political and social changes amassed since her childhood. These deeply affect her feelings and relationships to both her childhood home and her abandoned home in Montreal.

This touristic re-engagement with place can be a part of second home mobilities as well. A short chapter in MacGregor's book *The Weekender* traces a visit he makes shortly after the deaths of his father and his sister to visit the former site of his grandparents' home in Algonquin Park. Along with his mother and cousin, MacGregor returns to this formative space in order to reflect upon the loss of family members and the past summers spent together. This experience is physical, but is also marked by vivid engagements with the virtual place and memories of this home:

> *We cannot enter a log home that is no longer standing, but we enter, easily and happily*, the sounds that stand guard for us, waiting: the wind and the water, the sound of this lake on this point – a voice that belongs nowhere else . . .
>
> My mother sits on a large stone and watches Don and I dive from the high rocks much as we dove in the '50s and '60s, *the splash the same, the whoop the same, the footholds getting back out the same*, only slippery from disuse.
>
> I wander off and find, back of where the outhouse once stood, a rusted old straight pipe that once carried the exhaust from our coal-oil-driven washing machine out the porch door. I cart it back and we stand and marvel at it, *each hearing again* the heavy burp of the machine in full throttle, the memory bittersweet in that it speaks to us of summers lost, but reminds, as well, of the rule that forbade swimming when the washing machine was on because no one, we were told, would ever hear our cries for help if we got in trouble. (MacGregor, 2005, pp. 120-121, emphasis added)

Being in the space again, these visitors actively experience it not only as it is, but also as it was – engaging with the space in such a way that they can re-place the boundaries of the log home, the experience and role of water and swimming, and even the connection of objects to sounds and rules that defined the place of this home.[xlvi] As MacGregor notes, the memories of this place can be both 'bittersweet' and a source of happiness, and this trip to re-engage with space and place is crucial to both marking the past and moving on with the present.

Previous connections to space allow mobilities such as these to engage with changes within spaces, and by so doing, re-fashion notions of place. Incorporating or addressing changes, however, may not be desirable or pleasant. Especially in cases where return trips are driven by familial obligations, encountering social, economic, and political changes can be an unwanted consequence of, rather than a motivation for, return (Nguyen and King, 2004, p. 179). When travel involves cultural and subjective connections to spaces, differences between imagined place and experience space can require delicate treatment (Louie, 2003). Striking changes that demand a re-negotiation of place can thus be both sought out and actively avoided.[xlvii]

Return home and second home mobilities can thus involve touristic engagements with changes within places. Changes within spaces that are introduced through transit and mobility can lead to discrepancies with pre-existing notions of place, and thus return experiences are an opportunity in which place can be re-arranged and re-ordered to incorporate new understandings of the materiality of space. In effect, return visits allow individuals to create understandings of place that may not entirely superceded previous ones, but nonetheless incorporate new understandings of the change that has occurred over time.

These insights on the interaction and overlap between tourism and home, along with the interconnected networks of space and place outlined in the previous chapters, suggest the need for a new approach in studies of tourism. The next section outlines several important factors that must be incorporated into new work on tourism.

Tourism throughout mobilities – towards new epistemologies and methodologies

As these cases show, mobilities involve many interconnected spaces, and in order to understand the practices in any one location, it is important to have an understanding of other spaces and places along the mobility. The insights in this study regarding the mobility of places, the way relationships to place can spark touristic mobilities and tourism of the everyday, and the importance of re-placing touristic changes within spaces rely on a framework that includes multiple sites of study. This framework suggests the type of insights that have been overlooked due to the epistemological and methodological frame of previous studies of tourism. Extended spatial and temporal frames must be incorporated into future studies of tourism, accompanied by an awareness of interactions with place and the potential for touristic practices to appear at any point within complex mobilities. Finally, in order to prevent rigid relationships between home and tourism spaces, the identification of touristic change must include not only home, and other spaces of importance, but also significant places and elective centers as points of reference.

As Hall has noted alongside his survey of articles published in *Tourism Geographies*, tourism is predominantly studied only in singular tourist destinations, while tourism generating regions, multiple destinations and intervening spaces of travel are left unaddressed (2005a, p. 93). Considering the importance of activities such as planning trips, negotiating security in spaces of transit, and going through pictures upon return, this spatial and temporal bias marks a striking omission. Hall thus questions how studies of tourism can be deemed representative of the phenomenon when they only consider one temporal and spatial phase of the travel process, and suggests that examinations of tourism must be extended to include these alternate phases of tourism (2005a).[xlviii] This suggestion echoes criticisms that much work on place attachment has characterized place as self-contained and bounded, rather than acknowledging interactions and connections between places (Gustafson, 2006). Though limited work within tourism studies has responded to Hall's call, the memoirs of this study demonstrate a significant awareness of the many segments of travel mobilities.

Memoir authors temporally and spatially extend the object of their discussion beyond the limits of most previous studies of tourism, addressing primary homes, second homes and other spaces in between. MacGregor's retelling of the search for Ermine Lake, for example, provides an excellent image of what it might look like to examine tourism within its generating region, in transit, and at the destination. This example also illustrates the way in which both cyclical and linear temporalities are intertwined in mobilities. MacGregor's search for Ermine Lake is limited physically by the seasonal time that blankets his cottage in snow and concentrates his visits within a certain portion of the year. It is also connected, however, by a linear timeline stretching from when the search was instigated until the lake was found. MacGregor's narrative of the search for Ermine Lake provides a suggestive image of what it might look like to extend the temporal and spatial boundaries within studies of tourism. The memoirs of this study illustrate that rich insight can stem from considering multiple spaces and extended timeframe and they also suggest that the partitioning off studies of tourism into tourist destinations and singular trips may counter individuals' own understandings of the connections between spaces.

Though spaces of transit are addressed in the texts of this study, they are given limited attention, and deserve a fuller examination in futures studies. Perniola identifies transit as the location for emerging change, and thus the spaces traversed while individuals are in transit become of central importance. Spaces such as airports and roadways have been attributed a fundamental solitariness in Augé's theory of 'non-place'(1995), and have likewise been seen as unimportant spaces of liminality that do not transform experiences of tourism in other destinations. As this study has illustrated, however, these spaces of transit can become important places, as in MacGregor's extended interactions with the bush around Ermine Lake. It is therefore necessary to consider not only the relevance of solitary and disconnected experiences in space, but also the ways in which spaces of transition are involved in negotiations over time, leading to the re-placing of spaces such as motorways in different historical periods (Merriman, 2004). Spaces of transit can also be significant places that affect and are affected by other spaces and places of tourism.

Hall's argument for an extended spatial focus is thus supported by the texts of this study, which demonstrate how knowledge of originating spaces and multiple destinations can greatly affect interpretations of practices and interactions with place in destination areas. This study, however, goes beyond Hall's suggestions to illustrate the importance of including virtual, mobile place alongside extended spatial and temporal boundaries in studies of tourism.

Though Hall highlights the importance of multiple spaces within tourist mobilities, he does not differentiate between spaces and places. This silence leaves Hall unable to discuss the intangible places that are important components of the mobilities and touristic activities in this study. Many scholars have failed to consider the omnipresence of virtual place that is so strongly expressed by those such as Dionne Brand (2001). Brand's musings on diasporic identity illustrate how the tangible remains and ghostly traces of absent spaces circulate in cities, homes and spaces of transit through names, memories, and images (cf. Burman, 2006a). By failing to understand the continuing, lived influence of multiple mobile places we limit possible insights into engagements with touristic

spaces and practices. An understanding of place helps to bring greater focus to the particularities of return home and second home mobilities. It also provides a unique context in which to study practices such as browsing through travel brochures before a trip and looking at photographs after returning from a trip, and suggests how these practices are connected to those undertaken in the tourist destination. In this way, mobile place is an invaluable tool for investigating touristic engagements.

Hall's argument is also limited by his apparent desire to keep tourism isolated as a social phenomenon. Though he argues that tourism must be studied differently, and over greater time and space, he still maintains that there is a separation between tourism and non-tourism trips or excursions. Considering the frame of human mobility in which tourism now occurs, Hall argues, leads to the conclusion "that tourism needs to be recognized as just one form of temporary mobility occurring in space and time" (2005a, p. 94). Though tourism does need to be considered alongside other mobilities, Hall suggests that tourism remains distinguishable from other types of temporary mobility, and potentially even unique in its space and time characteristics. As this study of marginal cases of tourism has suggested, contemporary mobilities have had a profound affect upon understandings of tourism, and it is difficult if not impossible to definitively separate tourism from many other similar phenomena. Though tourism as an industry remains identifiable, touristic practices are not isolated within particular spaces or mobilities. Tourism is better understood then as a continuum of practices that can occur in many diverse spaces and be interspersed throughout many types of temporary mobilities.

It is important that the tourist generating regions identified within Hall's model do not become equated with static primary homes. The problems of such a model have been discussed, and though a particular home space may be the apparent beginning of a touristic mobility, it is important to also acknowledge the role of other spaces and places in generating travel. We need to consider how tourist destinations may generate tourism themselves, or how extended travel can give way to a longing for the change of visiting a primary residence. In such cases, the primary home might be approached very touristically upon the return – the travel having allowed for a new perspective from which to observe the uniqueness of previously familiar and everyday locations.[xlix]

This point is important because fixing the points of reference for tourism prevents a full consideration of the connection between the multiple spaces within mobilities and the interactions with place that occur over time and space. Instead, this study has suggested that a conception of change is required which brings significant flexibility to points of reference. Identifying change and difference as emergent within transit and mobilities equalizes the spaces involved and erases the primacy or superiority of any referents for comparison. Mobilities encompass many locations, and multiple spaces and places can be central to understanding them. Previous distinctions between ordinary and extraordinary places are no longer helpful then, for "when movement and circulation are the norm rather than the exception, when people regularly reside in more than one place, it is difficult to say which is the everyday place and which is the extra-ordinary one"(Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999, p. 228). Memoir authors demonstrate the importance of negotiating and marking manifestations of the extraordinary and the

ordinary that do not fit prevalent home-centered models. When MacGregor travels, it is not his primary home, but his cottage "a place even better than "home"" (2005, p. xiii) that is central in his thoughts and which, presumably, is used as a reference point for the locations he visits. For Blaise, it is the impending visit to India that overshadows his primary home and provides a point of comparison for his travels in Europe. Though his family had planned to spend a month in Europe before arriving in India, Blaise is bored and cannot stop dreaming of being in India:

> A vision of India – or rather, of me *in* India – was ripening. I seemed to see myself learning Bengali stupendously fast and speaking it with friends; I saw myself at Satyajit Ray movies, at concerts and plays in a crisp white *dhoti*. I saw myself eating curry with my fingers. I was looking forward to heat (especially in frigid Paris wearing my Miracle Mart Korean cottons), and for the first time the art of Europe, even of Amsterdam, had been a bore. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 9)

Boredom and frustration come not from comparisons to his primary home, but rather from comparisons to the place he imagines India to be. In the past, Blaise was not bored by the art of Europe, but in comparison with the promises he imagines to be waiting for him in India, his experience changes.

In this way, the mobility of place allows for places to become referents for comparison when visiting new spaces. As Hetherington notes, "the subjective world of memory, image, dream and fantasy, so often associated with place, operates by assembling materials into representations and using those representations to establish the difference between one place and the next" (1997, p. 189). Since places are established by comparisons to others, considerations of touristic places or practices must also take into account the multiple places that can be used for comparison, rather than just the traditional place and space of home.

This attention to places as referents marking tourism and change is important because the primary occupation and use of one space, such as a city home, does not mean that its corresponding place is also primary. For an immigrant from China, everyday activities could remain touristic for some time because the places of China and previous homes remain of prime importance and are used as points of comparison. Cohen et al. characterize this situation as individuals' attempts to find their own 'elective' centers in the secularized world following the breakdown of totalizing traditional religious and social ideologies (1987). These 'elective' centers provide grounding and meaning for individuals' lives, and need not belong to or be spatially grounded in the particular social community to which an individual is born. Rather, they can be found through activities such as traditional religious conversion, joining the occult, immersing oneself in science fiction, or undertaking tourism to engage with authentic Others (Cohen et al., 1987). This study suggests that for some second-home owners, such as MacGregor, their cottages may be deemed their chosen elective centers. Similarly, immigrants like Chiang can retain connections to previous homes that maintain these spaces and places as their elective centers.

The importance of considering place as a referent point for tourism is thus supported by a consideration of individuals' potential separation from elective centers. For science fiction enthusiasts, the places that are most important to them, and around which they center their world, are fictional, created through representations in text, pictures, and cinema. Others, such as some North American Zen Buddhists, can find themselves spatially separated from the communities that make up their center. In these cases, interactions with place – memories of previous physical interactions, or representations of community and ideology – are of central importance. For these individuals, as for some second-home owners or immigrants, what qualifies as touristic change or novelty will depend on comparisons not to the spaces they inhabit, but rather the places connected to their elective centers. It is important then, that studies of tourism consider both physical spaces and intangible places as possible points of reference for touristic change.

Future work on tourism must therefore make an effort to treat tourism as something occurring in many forms within a network of interconnected spaces and places. Mobilities are key to understanding the emergence of change within experience, as well as the importance of multiple and mobile reference points for marking comparisons between places. Tourism methodologies must therefore address multiple spaces, mobile places, and the fundamental mobility of individuals.

Conclusion

Having rejected the rigid relationship between home and tourism that is spatialized in previous academic studies, this chapter has further expanded understandings of the possible interactions between tourism and home in many spaces. A consideration of Blaise and Mukherjee's mobility to and through India revealed touristic interactions with other people's lives and homes, and highlighted the importance of acknowledging both touristic and non-touristic components of mobilities. Though tourism has long been associated with particular mobilities paths, Blaise and Mukherjee's case points out that we cannot assume mobilities are essentially or entirely touristic. Labeling tourism in this way binds it to particular mobility paths, and limits understandings of the heterogeneity of experiences and referents of tourism. It also ensures that attention remains focused on classic cases of tourism, and the circular mobilities they tend to display. Experiences 're-placing' and integrating change into experiences of home also highlights the mutual affectivity of spaces and places, as well as the possibility for simultaneous engagements with tourism and home.

The mutual affectivity of experiences in different locations within mobilities has recently been incorporated into understandings of transnational communities, and must also be extended to studies of tourism. As Preston et al. note, "transnational ties . . . include relationships that connect one place to another, in the process redefining both places" (Preston et al., 2006, p. 103). Burman similarly notes the influence that diasporic populations have on their new cities of residence, but argues that this influence is often ignored (2006b). Just as migrant connections and transnationalism erase borders and contribute to a fluidity and continual morphing of societies in multiple locations (Satzewich and Wong, 2006), so must our examinations of tourism take into account the

process of negotiating mobilities in multiple locations. Even homes can be re-interpreted in light of experiences away from them, and this process of interacting and integrated knowledge of spaces and places must be researched further.

Louie, in a study of organized trips of return to China for Asian-Americans, highlights the ways in which these cultural trips shape and are shaped by the visitors' experiences of hyphenated identity in the United States (2003): "The two locations are not significant to Chinese Americans independent of each other. Therefore, to be meaningful, one location must reference the other – villages in China are significant only because they are from where ancestors originated, and experiences as Americans are unavoidably defined in relation to these origins in China" (Louie, 2003, p. 757). Motivations, expectations and interpretations for their return are thus fundamentally shaped by experiences of being Asian American, and the dialogue between the spaces and contexts of China and the United States is a crucial element to understanding such cultural tourism.

Work on tourism must therefore incorporate an understanding of the "overlapping attachments to multiple places" (Louie, 2003, p. 758) that shape and influence experiences in any one home or not-home place. Our concern must shift from singular groups and spaces (Maddern, 2004, p. 167), to incorporate an interest in multiple spaces (Conway, 2005), in order to acknowledge the way that even when spaces aren't marked by the cultural differences that are often found in studies of transnationalism, spaces and places in mobilities interact and collectively form experiences.

These insights suggest that future studies of tourism must extend their spatial and temporal focus to study the many phases of tourism. Considering the interconnection of spaces and places within mobilities, it is important to investigate how these facets operate within experiences of tourism, which in this view are not isolated within any particular space. Furthermore, these studies must incorporate not only an understanding of spaces and practices of tourism, but also the importance of intangible place. Places can become significant centers within individuals' experiences, and as such can function as mobile referents for comparing and integrating the change and novelty emergent in transit. In this way, tourism can no longer be assumed to exist only within relationships of home and not-home, but becomes rather a continuum of practices that are enacted at various points within complex mobilities.

Though tourism has always been understood within a comparative frame, this study has revealed that it is important to expand our consideration of which spaces and places are being used as points of comparison. In addition to one's home, or primary residence, other referents such as elective cultural centers (Cohen et al., 1987) and places that are interacted with frequently must be considered as guideposts for identifying touristic engagements with change. Previous mappings of tourism are not adequate. As Van Den Abbeele notes, "the voyage always exceeds the map, and by extension, exceeds any theory conceived in spatial terms as a map" (1992, p. 79). The texts of this study show the importance of relationships to places and spaces that are not primary homes; thereby demonstrating how we might move our focus from a concern with the mapped trajectory of tourism to consider rather the parts of the voyage not revealed in an examination of

spatial dislocation alone. As MacGregor's interactions with his cottage illustrate, places can have striking affects upon everyday life, as well as becoming central referents during periods of travel. Studies must therefore foster a re-consideration of reference points and the interconnection of spaces and places at various points along mobilities, rather than blindly dragging referents along complex mobility paths.

The final chapter reviews the new approach to studies of tourism and home that has been outlined in these chapters. Though this focus on the interconnection of multiple spaces and the role of tangible and intangible components holds many possibilities, precautions are also outlined. Factors such as intersectional identities and the proclivity of tourism studies to be biased towards privileged and powerful populations must be acknowledged and considered within future studies, in order to gain a deeper understanding of tourism as a social practice and phenomenon.

Chapter Six – Visions and challenges for tourism

After considering the insights of unique cases of marginal tourism, this study suggests a new vision for theorizations of tourism. This vision moves away from notions of tourism that are built upon maps of acceptable spaces or fixed patterns of dislocation between a home and a designated tourist space. Furthermore, it creates space to break through the epistemological and methodological barriers that have limited studies of tourism to those spaces marked as tourist destinations. Assessments of the change and novelty that define tourism must be expanded, and this change must be intangible as well as observable and physically manifest in built environments. The alternate version of tourism suggested here attempts to bring the theorizing of tourism closer to the theorizing of mobility and social life more broadly. Mobility, however, is not to be examined at the expense of the connections of place attachment that ground many understandings of home (cf. Gustafson, 2006). Rather, places, spaces, and mobilities must be considered as interactive parts of experience.[I]

Within this new conceptualization of tourism, there are several key points. Tourism can be seen as engaging with change and novelty in many spaces. In this way, it is spatially dispersed and spatially interconnected. Not only tourism, but also home, must be located and addressed then within all mobilities. Intangible structures of spatialization and virtual place are also central to a new understanding of tourism. Finally, tourism should be considered not only within the boundaries of a commoditized industry, but also as a social phenomenon more widespread than the industry it is connected to.

Openings for new theorizations of tourism

First, this study opens space for tourism to be acknowledged as a physical and virtual social practice that engages with change and novelty in many spaces. As has been shown, there are many types of mobilities that no longer fit within traditional understandings of tourism, and the motivations and practices in second home and return home mobilities are extremely diverse. Therefore, touristic practices can engage with change and novelty anywhere there is mobility or transit.[Ii] There is no necessary geographic pre-condition for occasions of tourism, and the change marking tourism can occur in transits between the same space as well as between different ones. Furthermore, I have suggested that the importance of place requires a consideration of how tourism might also occur in interactions with virtual places that are marked by significant changes from inhabited spaces. In this way, the transit that introduces change need not be physical, but can be intangible and virtual. This understanding of tourism complicates the classification of any mobility as inherently touristic, because all mobilities are seen to involve both touristic and non-touristic components.

Erasing the spatial requirements for tourism in this way raises questions about what distinction can then be made between tourism and recreation or leisure. For some scholars, no distinction is possible because leisure has become tourism (Bodewes, 1981; Crouch, 1999, p. 232). Once tourism can be located within everyday sphere, the line that distinguishes it from leisure or recreation becomes more difficult to enunciate. Those

who wish to claim differences between tourism and recreation have often centered their efforts on the area of motivations (Hall and Page, 2001, p. 86). Others have suggested, however, that efforts to separate tourism and recreation are futile. Williams uses convincing historical evidence to argue that the scale of facilities has corresponded to distinctions of practices as either leisure or tourism, and thus there is increasing difficulty in separating out tourism and recreation (2003, p. 36). Activities undertaken as tourists are largely similar to those practiced in leisure, despite contextual differences (Williams, 2003, p. 86). Indeed, tourist choices are significantly affected by preferred recreational activities, and in one case study holidays spent at home and at the British seaside were found to be largely similar (Billinge 1996 in Williams, 2003, p. 39). Other scholars have gone one step farther to say that social practices and tourism are now one and the same, because tourism is a universal modern stance (cf. universalized tourist gaze in Urry, 1995). This study makes no claim to the universality of a touristic approach to the world, but does hold that practices in any space can be potentially touristic. Thus, while acknowledging that expanding the spatial possibilities for tourism increases its similarities with leisure and recreation, this study makes no presumption that the categories have collapsed entirely. More research is needed to consider how this new conceptualization of tourism relates to leisure and recreation, keeping in mind that though the potential for tourism exists in all spaces, activities undertaken during leisure time are not necessarily touristic. Future studies must therefore consider an expanded conception of tourism in conjunction with other similar social activities.

Though tourism must be expanded to include practices in many spaces, and interactions with place, not all tourism will include these components equally. Rather, there will continue to be a continuum of touristic engagements, and future studies of tourism will benefit from examining marginal cases alongside more mainstream ones. Even within the marginal cases of this study, there are significantly different examples of tourism. Svenson notes that different types of visitors use second homes quite differently:

> Commercial users appear to take part in traditional 'tourist' activities such as visiting national parks, shopping, and sightseeing to a greater degree than the private cottage users, who appear to be more engaged in activities centred at the cottage and with socialising with friend and family. For the commercial cottager, the cottage itself may be incidental to the 'tourist' experience whereas, for the private cottager, the cottage may be more central to the 'tourist' experience. (2004, p. 68)

Touristic engagements can also be manifest in many ways within return home mobilities. Indeed, many return home trips resemble Visiting Friends and Relatives tourism, and the texts of this study illustrate how return trips can be incorporated into extensive mobilities that facilitate tourism. It is now ever more important to examine both marginal and mainstream examples of the touristic, so as to better conceptualize the distinctions between going to the international foods section of a grocery store and flying across the world to visit a local market.[lii] Such investigations must examine variances in the touristic over space and time, and consider how possibilities for touristic practices are related to repeated visits to spaces, or repeated interactions with place, or the unpredictable and uncontrollable elements of experiences.

Second, tourism must be acknowledged as a spatially dispersed phenomenon, in that it not only occurs in spaces all over the globe, but that it also interpolates these spaces into itself. Therefore, practices of tourism are not isolatable in singular locations. As Haldrup notes, mobilities have been followed more often than they have been examined (2004). Tourism, within both mainstream and marginal cases, has thus remained closed off to many possibilities of touristic experience. Particular methodological choices have introduced significant biases into how tourism is treated. Working from Fennell's outline of biases in studies of community relationships (1997), we can identify bias within many studies of tourism that stems from the emphasis of tourism occurring within particular physical boundaries, from the privileging of those who do not belong, from the use of temporal qualifications, and from a focus on local, rather than global, interactions. The cases of this study have illustrated insights that emerge when actively attempting to counter these biases, and thus provide insights that concur with Fennell's argument that there is "a greater interpenetration of the global and local than has hitherto been acknowledged" (1997, p. 108). Therefore, future studies must continue to foster a focus that incorporates diverse interactions spread throughout time and space.

Individuals, through their mobilities, are continuously creating and recreating relationships with many places and spaces, and so understandings of tourism cannot be limited spatially because the processes they entail are spatially dispersed. Climbing the stairs of the Eiffel Tower would not be possible without prior research into reaching Paris, and the journey itself. Neither is it isolated from a subsequent trip to climb the steepest section of the Great Wall of China, because the successful completion of the stairs makes the Great Wall seem easily attainable. To lose a sense of the connection between these spaces, or the many virtual places they are connected to, is to lose a significant portion of the richness of touristic experiences. The second home and return home narratives in this study address what Hall calls different phases of travel (2005a) by speaking to activities in primary homes, second homes, previous homes, other sites visited in and around these locations, as well as the cars, trains, boats that are used in transit. These locations represent, in Hall's terms, tourism generating regions, spaces of transit, and multiple destinations, and they are invaluable in creating an understanding of how practices are connected to multiple locations and spaces. Future studies will therefore benefit from the inclusion of multiple sites and the utilization of 'mobile methods' (Larsen et al., 2006, p. 6) that capture information about mobility and necessitate researchers' conceptual or physical mobility as well.

Third, this movement beyond circular structures for tourism demands a new treatment of tourism and mobilities. Mobilities must be acknowledged as containing both practices of tourism and practices of dwelling or home, and therefore, they cannot be labeled as entirely or essentially touristic. Such a generalized label fails to recognize the heterogeneity within mobilities. As Crang notes, we "begin going on holiday while we are at home", and so ""tourism" cannot be located in a neat box as happening "over there," in that distant location during that discrete period. Rather our anticipation and memories spill out on either side" (2006, pp. 61, 62). Home and tourism then are intertwined, and must remain so within mobilities. Neither should be emphasized to the exclusion of the other.

Fourth, tourism must be considered as involving significant intangible structures. Investigations of spatializations will highlight the intangible structures that support and shape touristic engagements, and investigations of the places involved in tourism are essential to furthering our knowledge about individual motivations and experiences of tourism. The arguments this study presents against limited and home-based understandings of tourism are in many ways arguments against the spatialization of tourism as occurring only with distant places. That this spatialization has been dominant is not surprising, considering the volume of promotional and informational material put out by the tourism industry, as well as the supporting materials of the publishing and television industry. Representations of tourism are significantly concentrated upon exotic, foreign locations, and thus tourism becomes spatialized as distant from everyday spaces. Indeed, the spatial proximity of tourist attractions and facilities can help to create "well-defined tourist spaces within which tourism itself becomes concentrated" (Williams, 2003, p. 95). These spaces are spatialized through individual practices and discursive acts, and speak significantly to the power to dictate and benefit from spatializations, which is held by certain groups, including those in the tourism industry. Future studies of tourism must therefore devote more attention to the spatializations involved in touristic interactions, both in order to further interrogate the marking of appropriate spaces and practices of tourism by those actors with significant power, as well as to investigate the way in which comparisons between spatializations might help to identify touristic engagements that are not supported by physical structures of the industry.

Virtual place is another significant conceptual category for furthering understandings of tourism. As this study has shown, mobilities of place interact significantly with cases of tourism. It will therefore be important to consider the relationship between place and tourism more carefully. Such examinations offer many possible contributions. For one, examining interactions with place could be important in further establishing the basis for travel probabilities. The texts of this case suggest that repetitive engagements with virtual place, in the form of memories and ideals and images, are related to a desire to undertake travel, if not to the execution of this travel. Tourism research has largely overlooked this area of activity, and more attention needs to be directed towards engagements with virtual place, both within common practices such as looking through pictures after returning from a trip, and in less tangible practices such as engaging with memories independent of immutable mobiles. Tourism is virtual constructions of desire and difference as much as it is physical experience, and we need to consider the role of information in preparing touristic subjects and touristic places (cf. Aronsson, 2004; Franklin and Crang, 2001, p. 10; Louie, 2003, p. 739). The role of virtual elements in this process has been neglected, and further research is needed to examine whether virtual touristic performances of space, or interactions with virtual space might be related to the probability of undertaking the mobilities implicated in these mental travels (cf. Sudnow, 1979, p. 12).

Finally, studies of tourism need to move from a focus upon different types of commoditized tourism to an examination of the different social components of tourism. That is, future studies of tourism must break away from a concentration upon the tourism industry. The social phenomenon of tourism, in terms of international travel to engage with change and novelty, would not have developed to this point without the support of

the travel industry, which has made travel easier and less risky (Williams, 2003, p. 71). As the industry has changed though, so has tourism, and it is important to consider how tourism, as a social practice, exceeds the industrial context that supports it. Considerations of the travel industry need not be left behind, but as Williams and Kaltenborn have argued, "Leisure/tourism is often less packaged, commodified, and colonial than contemporary academic renderings seem to permit"(1999, p. 214). In order to better understand the breadth of touristic experiences and practices, attention must be given to those elements that have been long commodified within tourism, those that have recently come under the wing of the tourism industry, and those that are not yet identifiable as tourist products.

Work on the niches of the tourism industry is still valuable, but must be complemented by considerations of things like virtual tourism, which might be represented as seeking change and novelty through non-material interactions and practices, and spatialized tourism, such as MacGregor's search for Ermine Lake. Thus far studies of tourism have primarily examined its role within the global economy, and now that formations of tourism have multiplied dramatically, universal declarations that all tourism is oriented to searches for authenticity (MacCannell, 1976) or the tourist gaze (Urry, 1990) are increasingly limited in their application. Even categories such as Visiting Friends and Relatives tourism are extremely imprecise concepts, as sightseeing trips often involve significant engagements with social networks, and the appeal of tourist places can influence visits to significant friends and family (Larsen et al., 2006, p. 98). We need therefore to move beyond understandings of tourism that rely on industry labels and boundaries because these are necessarily limited and bounded in their insights.

It is important that we better understand the breadth of social activities that are included within touristic practices and mobilities, as well as the breadth of practices that engage with change and novelty. Future explorations could delve deeper into how visiting one of the great wonders of the world is like and unlike De Maistre's imaginative journeys around his bedroom (1984).[liii] As well, new movements to re-invigorate banal spaces with novelty can be important parts of future work.

A recent guide from Lonely Planet lays out instructions for 'experimental travel'. This style of travel:

> evades definition, but it can loosely be described as a playful way of travelling, where the journey's methodology is clear but the destination may be unknown. Experimental Travel renders all destinations equal – whether the end of your journey is a desert island or a traffic island. It can as easily be done at home or away, and it doesn't require a large bank balance. All that is required is an adventurous spirit . . . (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 4, ellipses original)

Based in the tradition of surrealism and the situationists, this guide provides forty 'games' or 'invitations' to travel. Each is laid out like a scientific experiment, with a hypothesis, required apparatuses, and a method, as well as a difficulty rating. Though many of these games involve travel to other cities or locations, several also put forward ideas for re-engaging with everyday spaces. 'Alternative travel' suggests you re-discover your home by setting out on food and alternating between turning right and left at each

intersection you encounter (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 48) while 'Nostalgia trip' asks you to "indulge (or relive) your nostalgia for a place once visited by seeking it out in your own home town" (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 180).[liv] Experimental tourist Carmen Michael shares her experience of taking a nostalgia trip, and after searching for elements of Brazil in Sydney, Australia she notes that:

> There was no *cavaquino*, no old men playing drums on the pavement and, alas, no tight Lycra stretched inconceivably over huge asses, but I did meet the eclectic and elusive Brazilian tribe of Sydney. I had expected to discover new areas of Sydney but ended up fine-combing my own backyard – now I can only guess at how many other layers of the city are visible to the eye of a traveller rather than that of an indifferent local. (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 184)

As this testimonial suggests, tourism is in many cases a matter of chosen practices, and though the performative codes of everyday spaces of home and work are not supportive of tourism, this guide to experimental travel is but one example of ways in which individuals can engage with and inspire new choices and touristic experiences within familiar environs. Socially, these efforts to re-spatialize everyday space and change the performative codes attached to spatializations are important, as are imaginative journeys around familiar rooms, and must be considered as integral components of a more widespread investigation of social manifestations of the touristic.

Openings for theorizing home

In light of this presentation of tourism, and having acknowledged the mutual affectivity of multiple spaces and places, home must now be re-considered. The previous chapters have highlighted the ways in which homes affect and are affected by tourism, and the ways in which these spaces and places must be considered in tandem. Like tourism, home must be treated as a mobile, spatially dispersed, and complex entity. This section reviews such a treatment of home. Within studies of tourism, spaces and places of home and tourism must be addressed as similar, and inseparable from the mobilities in which they are embedded. Home is an integral part of all types of touristic practices, and touristic mobilities can even be undertaken in order to create places of home through the practices of particular performative codes. It is no longer possible, therefore, to leave home behind when considering the operation of tourism because the two are in some cases interactive and inseparable components of mobilities. In addition to incorporating an understanding of home into studies of tourism, there is a need to consider how home might be re-spatialized as an infrastructure for possibilities. Finally, home must be also considered as something experienced by unique and heterogeneous individuals. Intersectional identities have significant impacts upon experiences of home, and thus considerations of home and tourism must devote attention to the unique complexities experienced by different groups.

Though this project seeks to move beyond simple assumptions of home spaces as referents for touristic journeys, the importance of homes to personal experience cannot be denied. New conceptualizations of tourism must therefore engage with home, as not only a spatial concept, but also a virtual place, a relational construct, and something created interactively with experiences in many spaces.

When considering mobilities, we need to acknowledge multiple locations and facets of home. Tuan provides a particularly evocative suggestion that homes and 'home-like places' are created as a 'somewhat familiar world' in the pauses along our mobilities (2004, pp. 10-11). Multiple homes also occupy multiple scales: "Home is a house and, in the larger sense, a neighborhood, hometown, country – and, ultimately, the earth. Our identity expands and is enriched as the places in which we feel at home – if only temporarily – are multiplied"(Tuan, 2004, p. 12). Possibilities for home, like those for tourism, exist in many spaces. This mobile conception of home creates space to emphasize intangible and relational qualities, and establishes home as an extension of mobility rather than a contradiction to it (Dürrschmidt, 1997, p. 64).[iv] In this way, the mobility of homes can be regarded alongside other mobilities of place, and mobilities in space, as tools to inform individual engagements with touristic transit, change and novelty in the world.

Mobilizing home will in some ways bring it closer to tourism. Rather than seeing tourism and home as separate spheres with unique activities, this study suggests we move towards a model that understands these spaces as the same. Both tourism and home must be understood as mobile, tangible and intangible, possible in any space, and inextricable from the mobilities they are a part of. Homes then are not primary and secondary, but rather are "linked spaces that together constitute a 'home' and continuum of experience"(Perkins and Thorns, 2006, p. 81). Such a model helps to displace the possibility of tourism into all spaces, and in some ways draws home closer to tourism: "when conceptualizing the home not as one centre but as something that is created in movements and can appear in several locations, the idea of being at home becomes closer to those modes of tourist experience that are characterized by strong enthusiasm for particular places"(Tuulentie, 2006, p. 147). Such an understanding of the possibilities for multiple dwelling (McIntyre et al., 2006b) must inform future work on tourism and home.

In addition to being similar, tourism and home are intertwined. As the cases of this study illustrate, tourism can involve significant engagements with home. Such engagements can come in the form of revisiting existing homes, escaping homes, or even as Larsen et al. suggest, the search for homes (2006, p. 44). Second homes can become important spaces for anchoring place attachments and experiences of community and safety within a world that is often overwhelming (Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999; Williams, 2002). This search for home through tourism can also be found in non-marginal types of touristic practices. Even when individuals journey to new locations for the purpose of sightseeing, they can expect and engage with familiar everyday objects, such as satellite television, or everyday food, found in the nearest McDonalds or Starbucks (Ritzer and Liska, 1997). In this way, searching for interactions with home can become a central part of tourism.

Considering the interaction of tourism and home, we can suggest that performance codes are relational and mobile in space, and as such can be used to establish temporary homes (Tuan's places created during a pause) during practices in unfamiliar vacation locations. Shields notes that spatializations include "performative codes which relate practices and modes of social interaction to appropriate settings"(1991, p. 46). If home is spatialized as a realm of comfort and family then, appropriate practices for home spaces might involve

bonding with family members. Bonding with family members in a non-home space then could establish a temporary home place. Haldrup, for example, notes in his study of travel mobilities to rented second homes that many visitors orient their mobility to a category he calls inhabiting (2004).[lvi] Inhabiting is "more concerned with the extraordinary ordinariness of personal social relations" (Haldrup, 2004, p. 443), and involves families using a vacation to create a place of home:[lvii]

> Building castles in the sand and collecting mussel shells and stones to decorate the holiday house are not only children's play, but also a constructive effort to symbolically domesticate the stages of vacation: hence transforming the place of vacation into a home. (Haldrup, 2004, p. 444)
>
> In other cases the exploration of landscape is imputed with a specific meaningful purpose: fishing, picking berries and mushrooms that can be prepared for the family meal later on. (Haldrup, 2004, pp. 445-446)

In these cases, practices enunciate the rented home as a gendered domestic space of the family. Sometimes, Haldrup suggests, families may even find themselves feeling "more at home in the fantasy world of the holiday house than in their permanent daily residence" (2004, p. 445). Travel can in this way be involved in the creation of homes,[lviii] through practices that articulate performative codes of home and solidify family bonds that are seen to reside in places of home.

In addition to considering new mobilities of home, more work can be done to engage with the spatialized possibilities of home. As outlined in Chapter One, I suggest that a new spatialization of home as infrastructures for certain life activities and certain relational experiences could help to support new non-patriarchal spatializations and could leave room to consider experiences of home that are not positive or joyful. The openness of such a framework of possibilities and infrastructure is both a strength and a weakness. It is valuable in that it leaves space to consider the various articulations of home within different cultural settings. In this way it recognizes and therefore allows for the comparison of many different experiences of home, however, this breadth may also prevent it from resonating with many personal experiences. For this last reason it is unlikely to become a popular social spatialization. It remains valuable though as a tool for challenging the exclusivity of many spatializations of home and for guiding future work that engages with social constructions and experiences of home.

It is no longer possible then to treat home merely as a static referent point for establishing touristic change. Homes are rather important nodes within complex networks of space and place that influence touristic practices and mobilities. Touristic change occurs in the transit from the same to the same, and thus homes must be considered alongside non-homes as equally relevant sites for understanding tourism. Putting homes on a similar plane with other spaces and places is not meant to refute the particular importance of houses and homes to individuals, for there is still a diversity of engagements with space and place. Rather, mobilizing home and suggesting the importance of home to considerations of tourism highlights the need to consider the widespread import and influence of homes upon individuals' interactions.

This work must proceed with a careful attention to the diversity of experiences of home that are related to individuals' intersectional characteristics. As highlighted in the first chapter, home has been spatialized in particularly gendered ways, and individuals' gender plays a significant role in experiences of home and the performative codes of home. Cultural differences can also significantly alter experiences of home, as noted in the discussion of obligations to visit home and the importance of Confucian devotion in Chapter Two. Thus the particular characteristics of individuals must be considered when examining how home and tourism interact. Furthermore, we cannot pay attention to only one of these characteristics. Work on intersectionality has highlighted how the convergence of multiple dimensions of subordination creates complex situations that are not adequately understood when studying any one dimension (Brah and Phoenix, 2004; Crenshaw, 1991). Minority women, for example, can find themselves uniquely disadvantaged by virtue of their intersectional identities.[lix] Work on tourism and home must therefore remain aware of not only the influence of singular dimensions such as sex or race, but also of the intersectional influence that multiple dimensions can have upon experience.

In some cases, intersectional characteristics may serve to limit engagements with home or tourism, and in others, they may open up new possibilities. Mukherjee, for example, finds that her previous mobility away from India facilitates her occupation of a paradoxical space not open to her other friends who are Indian women:

> On this trip to Calcutta, I saw myself through the eyes of others, and realized that the paradox remains but tears none apart. To my relatives – who accorded me the status of an honorary male by urging me to eat with Clark and the uncles at the first shift at the dining table, instead of on the floor on the second and third shifts with my aunts and girl cousins – I was the embodiment of a "local girl makes good." And I was also an intimidating alien, a raspy-voiced woman who was not content to be simply a schoolteacher or charity organizer (which were appropriate enough women's work), but who argued with male relatives about tax breaks and inflation and who was not prepared to accord automatic homage to Sai Baba. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, p. 225)

Despite her transgression of gendered norms of conduct in India, Mukherjee's mobility helps her to become recognized as having achieved success. In this way, her transit opens space and opportunities, such as eating with the men, which would not otherwise be available to an Indian woman. In this way, intersectionality can have significant impacts upon experiences of tourism, mobility and home, and therefore remains another important concern for future studies of tourism.

The insights of this study have supported suggestions regarding new approaches to the study of tourism and home. Homes must be treated as multiple and mobile, interwoven with tourism in many spaces. Not all homes are the same though. Personal attributes can affect experiences of home, and these different experiences must remain a focus of investigation because they speak to the operation of power and privilege. The final section of this chapter takes a closer look at other aspects of power and privilege that operate in the cases of this study, and which must be considered in future work.

Privilege, assumed mobilities, and the operations of power

Though this study of mobilities involving marginal tourism has been effective in expanding our understanding of the relationships between tourism and mobility, it has also retained a bias of privilege that has marked much work in this area. The tourism discussed here has remained biased to particular classes of individuals, and the cases highlight mobilities while also obscuring the way in which they are unequally accessed. Despite these limitations, these cases suggest ways in which tourism can be opened up as a concept to include less powerful and privileged populations. Changing the geographic requirements for tourism opens space for examinations of less mobile populations, and facilitates considerations of tourism as a wider social phenomenon. This new approach to tourism must be pursued with a concern for the power of tourism industries, the power of individuals, and the inequalities that can be attached to different cultural backgrounds. These concerns must be addressed in order to ensure that tourism does not remain a practice and concept accessible only to the privileged.

Since its origins in Cook's Grand Tours, tourism has been primarily studied as an activity performed by and accessible to the elite members of society. In order to undertake many types of touristic mobilities, individuals require not only significant financial resources, but also temporal resources and cultural supports (cf. Greenblat and Gagnon, 1983). For many individuals, the necessary capital is unattainable, and exclusion has therefore been a prevalent characteristic of the tourism industry. Exclusion has continued in many academic studies, and even in cases of marginal tourism (cf. Hall, 2005a, p. 95). Though access to second homes has opened up at times, it has predominantly been a privilege available only to the elite (Hall and Müller, 2004b). Second home and return home mobilities also depend on significant outlays of money, time, and cultural resources, and are not, therefore, inherently effective in challenging the longstanding class biases within studies of tourism.

Though the texts of this study have been helpful for engaging with the issues of tourism and mobility, they too represent a particularly privileged experience. Travel writing can be 'pseudoautobiography' "that, while purporting to examine the "real-life" (traveling) writer's personality, ends up instead by emphasizing the facticity of the (traveling) written subject" (Holland and Huggan, 1998, p. 17).[ix] Both theorizing and writing about travel are significant enactments of power, and those with the temporal, economic, and literary resources to undertake such practices often use them to uphold imperialistic and privileged assessments of the world (Holland and Huggan, 1998). Though the texts of this study deal with spaces and communities that are to some extent familiar, and therefore not as susceptible to imperialistic judgments, their assumptions regarding mobility do betray positions of privilege.

The texts of this study not only speak to mobility, but also obscure its operation. That is, all of the texts treat mobility as mostly unproblematic and easily achieved. Authors assume not only their own ability to find the time and money to undertake travel, but also often the ability of their reading audiences to do so. They treat mobility as inherently attainable, and by so doing obscure the importance of the resources that make mobility

possible. MacGregor addresses the problem of encountering friends who do not want a second home because they don't understand its appeal (2005, p. 231), but he makes no mention of those who cannot have a second home, for whatever reason. In Chiang and Phillips' narratives of returning home, China's political situation and governmental restrictions on travel are discussed as obstacles to mobility, however other factors that might restrict mobility, such as a lack of money or time, receive little attention. Furthermore, Liu remarks upon the cultural importance of mobility and immigration, as opportunities to gain skills and knowledge that will lead to future prosperity (2005, pp. 5-6). The treatment of mobility and travel experiences in the texts thus justifies the authors/narrators' right to freedom, claim on self-determination, and entitlement to leisure (cf. Greenblat and Gagnon, 1983). The corollary of this framing is a denial of the rights of those for whom mobility is not an unproblematic assumption.

Though many individuals are very mobile today, it is important to not overemphasize this trait. Mobility is increasingly prevalent in many communities, but it still "remains a relative privilege" (Franklin and Crang, 2001, p. 11). Many people never move to another location on a permanent basis, and have limited experiences with temporary mobility (Hammann et al. in Dawson and Johnson, 2004, p. 117). These texts, and many other examinations of tourism, have completely excluded populations that are less mobile. Though the memoirs of this study highlight mobilities that have been overlooked in previous studies of tourism, they also remain silent about the structures of power that control access to mobility, and this silence is a significant weakness.

Despite this weakness, the texts of this study have facilitated an exploration of tourism within different boundaries, and the insights from this exploration can be used to open up conceptualizations of tourism within all populations. More than the particularities of these cases, it is the gaps they have revealed in how tourism's mobilities are treated that will be important for future theorizations of tourism. Previously, the boundaries placed around studies of tourism have marked many forms of travel and many spaces as being outside the realm of tourism. An insistence that tourism occurs away from home creates a bias that favors those with extended mobility patterns. The new vision for tourism outlined here, however, creates possibilities for identifying tourism in any space. This opportunity alone opens up the potential for tourism to all populations, not only those with the resources to undertake active travel mobilities.

Taking the approach to tourism suggested here creates an opening that lies outside of the tourism industry in which to consider tourism as a social practice shared by diverse populations. Though a lack of temporal, economic, and cultural resources can prevent many individuals from undertaking trips and touristic practices, non-traditional populations still experience virtual interactions with place and changes within space, and these touristic encounters deserve more consideration. Certain spaces may be impossible for some populations to inhabit, but familiar spaces and virtual places might remain accessible locations for their interactions with the touristic. In this way, broadening the possible spaces and places for tourism can also broaden the groups of individuals who can be included within studies of tourism.

Though tourism must be examined in many populations, this argument must not be seen to mark differing levels of mobility as unimportant factors. There are significant differences in mobility patterns not only between those with differing levels of economic capital, but also between different generations (Hall, 2006), and these must be acknowledged and examined. Furthermore, there are differing levels of choice involved in mobilities, and these variations deserve attention. All of these differences must, however, be addressed within a framework that can acknowledge mobilities of many lengths and with many different relationships to homes and constraints. That is, if tourism can't be seen to include all of these diversities, the operation of power that is implicit in them can never become tourism's problem. Despite differences, mobilities affect all individuals, and even those who do not travel much are often connected to networks that contain others who are more mobile and who live far away (Larsen et al., 2006, p. 85). Therefore, the framework that this study supports, one of spatially dispersed touristic practices that are integrated into mobilities, is a necessary tool for expanding our understanding of tourism. It creates space for considering tourism as a social practice located within the experiences of many different individuals.

Future work will need to remain concerned with the operation of power in tourism. Considerations of how economic capital is distributed and affects experiences of tourism will remain important. There is also a need, however, to highlight the other types of capital that are required and involved in tourism. In a recent study, Larsen et al. speak of network capital and suggest that networking, and not sightseeing, is now the primary concept for leisure and travel theory (2006). Networking creates space for an understanding of the work involved in tourism, the obligations of many types of travel, the social relations that are produced by travel, the social capital generated through travel, and the connection between places, events, and sociabilities (Larsen et al., 2006, p. 110). Not only economic capital then, but also social capital and network capital – found in the cars, mobile phones, and internet access points that facilitate communication and co-presence between people – are needed for travel and tourism (Larsen et al., 2006). Significant personal relationships and network capital can thus facilitate VFR tourism even when individuals do not have the economic capital for other types of tourism. That is, "distant connections enable people with modest incomes to travel further than their income would otherwise allow" because the hospitality of friends and family can result in free accommodations and meals (Larsen et al., 2006, p. 97). Accessibility to tourism must, in this context, take on a new form, and future studies will need to engage with how everyday tourism and networking change notions of accessibility.

Reconsidering tourism also allows a reconsideration of the possibilities for empowerment within studies of tourism (cf. Crouch, 2005). The concern for mobile place, spatialization and the interaction between spaces outlined here has great potential for becoming political. Though Williams uses a different understanding of place, he highlights that place attachment and a sense of place are political concepts because of the way they enunciate relationships of difference and define what is acceptable within place (2002, p. 354). Place, as used in this study, is also political in that it is centrally attached to the power to manipulate objects. As well, the enactment of place is connected to social spatializations and myths of space, and together they entrench particular comparisons and

differences. The process of placing the space of a cottage draws from and reinforces mythologies that center upon the difference between city and cottage, and examining this process critically can reveal assumptions as well as competing claims to place that are intrinsically political. There is significant room then to use new understandings of tourism's spaces and places to explore the empowerment and power within tourism.

The cases of this study will also be useful for further work on how cultural and individual characteristics reproduce inequalities within studies of tourism. Return home mobilities are quite prevalent among migrant cultures based in areas such as Asia and the Caribbean, and have remarkable similarities to VFR and heritage tourism. Both return home mobilities and heritage tourism, for example, are concerned with making connections to place and personal history. Academic work on tourism niches such as heritage tourism, however, is often "overwhelmingly populated by white faces" (Urry, 1990, p. 143). There are differences between these cases. Practices such as re-working notions of place, for one, are differently affected, by factors such as having intact networks of family and friends, having previously visited the space, and having a tourist infrastructure that supports heritage as a commodity. Still, the similarities between these two types of touristic flows raise questions about the diversity of populations within our tourism studies and whether attention to the infrastructure of the tourist industry has biased our findings to particular cultural contexts.

The relationship of tourism and culture must also be considered further in terms of unequal access or representation within intangible social infrastructures of tourism. As Rojek and Urry highlight, tourism and culture are no longer isolated from each other in time and space, and therefore we must consider the ways these spheres overlap and challenge previously held conceptual and political boundaries (1997, pp. 3-4). Thus not only physical resources and infrastructures, but also cultural structures such as spatializations and the folklore and mythologies surrounding nature and the Canadian cottage can be differentially accessible to various populations. Considerations of tourism must therefore consider not only marginal and mainstream cases of tourism, but also populations in which touristic practices have been considered to be both marginal and mainstream. Doing so will help to reveal the accessibility of the tangible and intangible structures that support tourism.

Concerns about the distribution of privilege and power must continue to inform studies of tourism. Any further developments of the framework outlined in this project must be directed not only towards understandings of the different aspects of tourism within populations that have been traditionally studied, but also within new populations that have often remained outside of tourism studies. Expanding the field of inquiry to include multiple heterogeneous populations, like expanding the spatial and temporal boundaries, will contribute to a greater understanding of tourism as a social practice.

Conclusion

This study has argued that the changing nature of global interactions and mobilities has necessitated a reconsideration of spatializations, conceptualizations, and methodologies

of tourism. No longer can tourism be regarded as something occurring in isolated locations and established in relationship to only material infrastructures and comparisons with static homes. Tourism is rather tangible and intangible, mobile, and spatially dispersed. As such, it is possible in all spaces and open to all populations. Mobility and transit cannot be detached from considerations of tourism because of the way in which they introduce change and the possibility for incorporating change into understandings of spaces and places. In this way, mobility demands a consideration of the networks of interconnected spaces and places that affect practices and mobilities of tourism and home.

Tourism must also be reconsidered alongside notions of home and power that have implicitly supported it. The approach outlined here allows homes to become mobile, complex, and potentially multiple within studies of tourism, and to be recognized as only one of many points of reference within networks of space and place. Finally, the power and privilege that operate within tourism and studies of tourism must be examined, so as to highlight how it is that touristic interactions can be open to multiple populations with differing mobilities. If there is something interesting about tourism as a social phenomenon, we should consider how it is manifest in all populations, and not only those with the greatest resources.

Though incorporating these insights into methodology will be challenging, it is a necessary step towards increasing our understanding of how spaces, places, and practices of tourism and home are important components of experience, and ones that weave throughout the everyday mobilities of all individuals. This view of tourism, as fundamentally mobile and networked, leaves no comforting home in which to ground our thoughts and work. It is rather a call to seek out the many homes for tourism, and to consider how experiences with mobilities of tourism might in fact exceed our imagined geographies of them.

Endnotes

[i] Though globalization has alternately been seen to involve de-territorialization and re-territorialization, the argument here is that concepts must be separated from inherent spatial references so that their relationships to spaces can be re-considered in the context of new social formations. Though Albrow's version of this process leans towards a conclusion of de-territorialization, other insights are also possible.

[ii] The phrase 'touristic mobilities' that is used in this paper therefore is not meant to indicate that such mobilities are primarily oriented towards tourism, but is rather used as a way of highlighting the touristic element of particular mobilities, which also contain everyday and banal activities alongside touristic ones.

[iii] The gendered divisions implied in spatializations that mark the home as feminine are both supported and created by the physical house itself: "As the mechanism of, rather than simply the scene for, this control, the house is involved in the production of the gender division it appears to merely secure.... In these terms, the role of architecture is explicitly the control of sexuality, or, more precisely, women's sexuality, the chastity of the girl, the fidelity of the wife." (Wigley, 1992, p. 336)

[iv] This spatialization has led to a significant body of literature that examines women's fear and (lack of) safety in public spaces (Koskela, 1997, 1999; McDowell, 1999; Panelli et al., 2004; Wesely and Gaarder, 2004).

[v] In my own experience as a solo traveller, I repeatedly encountered individuals who were shocked by the fact I was traveling around Asia alone. Many individuals commented that I 'must be brave' to do so, with their tone implying that 'risky' or 'stupid' were more appropriate labels.

[vi] Since home as a property is a masculine possession, women and girls often must claim provisional spaces within homes in which to undertake knowledge- and identity-work (cf. Lozanovska, 2002).

[vii] Less emphasis has been given to the gendering of tourism, an important issue that must be taken up more in future work.

[viii] Ghassan Hage, in an interview with Mary Zournazi, suggests the importance of 'homeliness' as a conglomeration of the experiences you feel at home: the experiences that get at what being at home means (Zournazi, 2002). For Hage, pinpointing these experiences of comfort, safety, and the successful achievement of joy is an important part of his work, and is centrally connected to the analysis of how migrants adapt to life in new spaces. Such work is also important to studies of tourism, and points to the value of considering home as a mobile set of physical and relational infrastructures that create the possibilities for such experiences.

[ix] I am indebted to Sara Dorow for her insight on this point.

[x] The sites of these return home mobilities are imbedded in histories of colonialism and imperialism that, while important, are not a central concern for this study. Having considered new conceptualizations of tourism in this study, future work will need to address how the particularities of individual cases and histories map onto new theorizations of tourism.

[xi] Bainbridge discusses moving to and working in China for a period of a year and a half. The text involves significant interactions with China as home, though it is Bainbridge's

wife, Starry, and not Bainbridge himself, who was born in China and can name it as a previous home. Gordon's humorous texts play upon stereotypes and spatializations of the cottage as an iconic place. Liu tells of the mobilities and transnational relationships of several generations of the Chang family, who migrate between China and the United States. MacGregor's 2005 text is formatted as a series of brief journal entries spanning a year at the cottage, and includes many of the same stories and anecdotes as found in his 2002 memoir.

[xii] Although the development of second homes happened during a similar period in different international locations, there are some notable differences. In North America, for example, second homes have been primarily purpose-built, that is, new constructions rather than renovations or purchases of existing properties. This has contributed to the commercial development focus of the second home market in North America, in contrast to European countries where second homes are often rural houses that were abandoned by agricultural workers and have been reclaimed as leisure properties (Bielckus, 1977, p. 35). Though this difference between purpose-built and preexisting second homes can be remarked upon as a general trend, authors have noted that within many countries there are periods of second home use that fit each of these models (Keen and Hall, 2004; Timothy, 2004). For example, Timothy names three phases of second home development in the United States: preexisting structures, prefabricated structures, and mobile homes and timeshares (2004, p. 147). This points to the regional and international heterogeneity of second home development.

[xiii] These frames are noticeably articulated within two discernable waves of academic work. The first wave found its inspiration in the work of individuals such as R. I. Wolfe, who began writing about summer cottages in the early 1950s (1952). This contributed to a swell of work on second homes during the 1970s. The seminal text within this period is J.T. Coppock's collection entitled *Second homes: curse or blessing?* (1977c). Covering Europe, North America, the Caribbean and Australia, this book deviates from the majority of the existing literature by undertaking a social scientific examination of the second home phenomenon. As the title suggests, the authors are concerned with quantifying second home use and then considering the social impact second homes have on surrounding communities. After this first wave of academic work on tourism, there was a lull until the 1990s. The second wave of work came as a result of the increasing prevalence of mobile retired populations, conflicts between locals and second-home owners, and worries about rural displacement (Müller, 2006). This work takes up many of the concerns raised in the first wave, albeit within more complex understandings of the global context and practices of second home use.

[xiv] This is not the only oversight within studies of second homes. Perkins and Thorns also note the bias in second home studies towards positive experiences, and the lack of critical and multidisciplinary approaches that are found in primary home literature (2006, p. 77).

[xv] Second homes have often been understood to hinder the mobility of their owners, because purchasing a second home involves taking on an obligation to maintain it. As Wolfe comments, "not only does the cottage tie its owner down; it makes demands on his time, his energy and his pocket" (1965, p. 6). Due to the required maintenance and the money spent, leisure time is usually devoted to the second home rather than other

potential leisure destinations. Second-home owners have been found to use other accommodation less frequently than non-owners (Bielckus et al., 1972, p. 103), as well as travel farther and more often in their cars (Dijst et al., 2005). Though this points to a decrease in overall mobility for second-home owners, it does not lessen the importance of understanding this mobility. On the contrary, the concentration of mobility around a second home suggests the importance of this site as a space in which touristic practices might be undertaken.

[xvi] Though some argue that 'diaspora' is a concept more properly concerned with issues of home than 'migration' is (Oxfeld and Long, 2004, pp. 5-6), turning attention to the possibility of returning to places migrated from introduces the importance of home into understandings of return migration.

[xvii] Unfavorable economic situations in many parts of China at the beginning of the 20th Century led to a similar situation where migration was seen as a means of increasing ones' opportunities for economic and social success. See (Oxfeld, 2004).

[xviii] As discussed in the first chapter, current tourism work tends to privilege one space/place over another. For example, Timothy and Teye's examination of return tourism to Elmina Castle, a former slave castle in Ghana (2004), fails to incorporate an understanding of the connection of this tourist space to many others, and an understanding of how it may have a continual influence upon experiences of other places, as Dionne Brand notes in her poetic memoir (2001). This study considers the importance of multiple locations for experiences of tourism, and suggests that such a framework is necessary for fuller understandings of how tourism is practiced by mobile individuals (see Chapter 4). The importance of considering multiple locations within studies, however, is also notably constrained by, and must be weighed against, the constraints of particular locations or multi-sited methods, as well as the choice that is involved in selecting sites of investigation.

[xix] Individuals engage with global capitalism within their everyday mobilities in a touristic way, Franklin suggests, because modernity is centrally about novelty, and tourism engages with this novelty. He argues that that tourism is not peripheral, but rather central to modern societies, intimately tied up in everyday life and social identities. Tourism, then, "is not synonymous with travel; it is a modern stance to the world, an interest and curiosity in the world beyond our own immediate lives and circles" (Franklin, 2003, p. 11). It thus involves many different individuals in many different spaces, "different people doing different things, locals and visitors, sojourners and residents, locals becoming visitors, sojourners becoming residents, residents 'being tourists,' travelers denying being tourists: resident part-time tourists, tourists working hard to fit in as if locals" (Cartier, 2005, p. 3).

[xx] Chiang, and Phillips to a lesser degree, constructs a narrative that is very sympathetic to the rhetoric of socialist progress and the triumph of the people in the new China, which is similar to the discourse noted in Louie's work (2003, p. 749).

[xxi] This memoir is separated into two parts, one titled 'Clark Blaise' and the other 'Bharati Mukherjee'. One author narrates each section, and therefore in this study discussions of either Blaise or Mukherjee's experiences correspond to the section marked by their name and narrative voice.

[xxii] The gaze is also a significant concern within postcolonial theory and postcolonial examinations of travel writing (Pratt, 1992).

[xxiii] In this first-person memoir, there is no distinguishable separation between the narrator and the author.

[xxiv] MacGregor included a very similar rant about the relationships between locals and tourists, containing many identical examples, in *The Weekender* (2005, pp. 135-138). Here he marks the situation as being one "where both visitor and local laugh at each other behind the other's back. And where neither could exist without the other" (MacGregor, 2005, p. 138).

[xxv] Such spatializations of nature have been actively used in the marketing of rural areas. Williams discusses how natural qualities of the wilderness have been emphasized so as to draw upon positive spatializations of such areas as havens for peace, tranquility, tradition and community (2003, pp. 145-146).

[xxvi] Others have also noted the relationship between escape and cottaging. Stedman, in a survey of cottagers in Wisconsin, finds that seeing the lake as 'escape' is the only significant predictor for the attachment of second-home owners to their cottages (2006, p. 141). For some, however, this relationship between escape and second homes is overstated. McIntyre et al., for example, "didn't find 'escape' to be as central in the discourse of home and away as it is often portrayed in the literature. Instead, we found that being away is often just a different way of being at home" (2006a, p. 313).

[xxvii] Williams and Van Patten suggest that this notion of a simpler and nostalgic lifestyle is a central component of stories of escape, and that in this way second homes are notable because they allow for a life lived differently than at a primary home: "As one second-home owner described the second-home experience: 'It's like stepping back in time ... There's a sweetness and simplicity to it.' Another respondent who was asked to describe her second home echoes this sentiment: 'It's like the old days ... It's like 30 years ago for us, much more relaxed and laid back.'" (2006, p. 36)

[xxviii] This is illustrated more fully in an extended passage from MacGregor's 2005 book:

"What I'm talking about is a cottage with 24,000 *miles* of shoreline – with year-round access from anywhere in the world. That's mine. Perhaps yours, as well. . . .

"I wouldn't have a cottage," people keep telling us. "You only get to use it for two or three weeks of the year. What's the point?" *The point?* Usually, we say nothing – for how do you explain, without causing a confidential report to end up in Human Resources, that those of us who do have cottages use them *every single day of the year?*

Mine is on my computer, a screen saver that I can change as the mood fits . . . and it is also in my imagination whenever required. I think about it while shovelling the driveway. I visit it when I'm stuck in traffic.

I worry about it, not deep-vein thrombosis, when flying across multiple time zones. That is not me snoring on the couch in mid-afternoon; it is me planning and organizing, doing the grunt work required for another perfect summer at the lake." (pp. 230-231)

[xxix] Sometimes his mental escapes to the cottage are also accompanied by physical actions, such as when he begins planning the annual family camping vacation taken while at the cottage. During his planning, MacGregor visits the canoe in his garage and

'lovingly' runs his hand along it, and then removes a paddle and mimes a few strokes through the air (MacGregor, 2002, p. 260, 2005, p. 143).

[xxx] This attachment to the virtual place of the cottage contributes to a state of ongoing travel anticipation that Jaakson notes as a characteristic which qualifies second-home owners as permanent tourists (1986, p. 388).

[xxxi] Palladio's work is notable because he designed spaces according to ideal geometric ratios. Beautiful social space was for him involved in a spatialization involving mathematical relationships, in which parts correspond to the whole. Gable and Gable comment on the harmony that they experience being within the carefully laid out spaces of the Villa Cornaro, and recount the considerable time they spent investigating the mathematical relationships between rooms in the villa. They find out that their 'Noah' room is used as a module in the design of the villa and the grand salon is the size of two of these modules placed side by side (2005, pp. 125-130).

[xxxii] Though authored by Carl and Sally Gable, Sally is the sole narrator within this text, and observations are framed within her first-person point of view.

[xxxiii] After looking at possible cabinetry for their kitchen renovation, Sally comments: "I'm convinced that if we install something asymmetrical, Palladio's ghost will rise from his grave in Vicenza and find a new home at Villa Cornaro, stalking around the kitchen every night, rattling pots, and moaning like the wind in agony from the injury to his spirit" (Gable and Gable, 2005, pp. 54-55).

[xxxiv] The constructing and ordering of space highlighted here and elsewhere is taken from Hetherington's understanding of place, and though this suggests possible connections to notions of the performativity of space and habitus, these issues are not explored in this paper.

[xxxv] Though this trip is to see the most authentic and well-restored Palladian villas, later in the text Gable and Gable speak of trips to see other Palladian villas that are in sad states of disrepair (2005, pp. 215-221, Chapter 47).

[xxxvi] In light of Palladio's use of ideal geometric ratios in his design, visiting other villas helps to increase the Gable's understanding of Palladio's ideal spatializations, and thus also of their space as one of many places constructed within this particular framework.

[xxxvii] Such a context brings new insights regarding the sameness of primary and second homes: "In this situation, escape is therefore a two-way track. Second-home owners escape their primary homes for a simpler life during their holidays and, once satiated, escape their second homes to have a more challenging, complex and stimulating life for the remainder of the time. In this process, primary and second homes become extensions of each other – both in a sense home, and a place of escape"(Perkins and Thorns, 2006, p. 80).

[xxxviii] Though this focus on multiple spaces and the importance of mobility differs from common Western spatializations of home that were outlined in Chapter One, it is difficult to assess whether these texts depart from prevalent spatializations in other ways. Many themes, such as the safety, security, relaxation, and community of home remain consistent. Some texts suggest different gendered spatializations of home, but on the whole discussions of 'home' per se are not extended enough for further evaluations. It is safe to say that these representations of second home and return home mobilities engage

with prevalent spatializations of home, appropriating some themes and challenging others.

[xxxix] By openly discussing the different roles she occupies, her section of the memoir constructs an understanding of social positions as always in the process of negotiation. Revisiting her home country leads Bharati to consider and reconsider her identity as both a migrant woman and a writer who remains forever connected to people and places a world away from the experience of many of her readers. The difference between Bharati and Clark's experiences could thus also be seen to inform an identification of the intersectionality of race and gender in experiences of mobility and home. The implications of such an intersectional identity are further explored in the concluding chapter.

[xl] Cohen, for example, is like many others and includes movement criteria within his definition of the tourist role (1974).

[xli] Indeed, these interactions with mobile place are facilitated and mediated by material objects and representations that have their own mobilities (cf. Latour, 1988).

[xlii] In this framework, changing spaces and places need not be stuck in determinations of progress or decline, but can be seen rather within a context of transitory spaces of difference couched between sameness.

[xliii] Tuan heavily emphasizes the affective element of place that Hetherington seeks to balance with his emphasis upon material interactions.

[xliv] As McHugh notes, Tuan "inverts our thinking about place as norm and mobility as departure in the aphorism, 'place is a pause in movement'" (2006, p. 51). Movement and mobility must therefore be understood as an integral context for discussions of place. Furthermore, this discussion of place as pause points to the necessity of considering both pauses, which are moments in time, and mobilities, where time can be seen as more of a flow. McIntyre et al. suggest in their work that considering a framework of 'multiple dwelling' allows a consideration of places that are pauses alongside mobility and movement, recognizing that one can dwell in both (2006a). Such an approach highlights multiple temporalities, as well as multiple spatial scales.

[xlv] As a student, Chiang enjoyed taking a steamboat trip from Nanking to Kiukiang, his birthplace, and upon his return he wants to re-experience this journey, but finds the number of ships making this trip has significantly declined, and there are no berths on the sole remaining ship (Chiang, 1977, p. 119).

[xlvi] Gordon mentions a similar engagement with space both as it is and as it was in his tale of how the fictional Fraser parents adapt to having children at the lake: "After hard days of helping the kids face the dragons, the Frasers wake up and realize how much the cottage means to them, how much they enjoy it. They start thinking about protecting it, wondering about how it will be used by their kids' kids. The light plays tricks on them. They turn a corner on the path and see their parents, their grandparents, people who have not been there for years. They see children who have not been there for years either, children who have become the Frasers." (1989, p. 92)

[xlvii] Mukherjee, on her return to India, enjoys returning to some spaces, but hesitates to revisit and re-place others. When she was a child, Mukherjee wandered through the spaces at her father's factory, dreaming of a Western life. The memory of these

experiences within a compound and lifestyle inaccessible to many others becomes a deterrent for visiting the space on her return because her physical presence in the space would require an acknowledgement of the privilege and ignorance inherent in this place of her memory (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977, pp. 183-185).

[xlviii] In a more experiential and less spatial breakdown, Fridgen highlights the five phases of recreation experiences outlined by Clawson and Knetsch: anticipation, travel to the site, on-site behavior, return travel and recollection (1984). This framework holds possibility due to its suggestion of both physical and virtual activities, as well as its lack of particular geographical referents.

[xlix] Indeed, Hall's argument must be used to open up the sphere of investigation, however his distinction between tourism generating regions, spaces of transit and tourism destinations leaves limited space to consider the messiness of these categories themselves. Cruise ships, for example, are simultaneously tourism destinations and spaces of transit. Future work must therefore be attentive to the blurry boundaries between these classifications of mobility.

[l] This study has primarily considered the experiential side of tourism, however Mosedale has made a similar comment regarding the importance of understanding spaces of both places and flows in regards to the consumption of tourism (2007). He suggests that commodity chain analysis is a necessary tool to understanding these dual components of tourism consumption.

[li] Though everyday and home spaces are often spatialized as ordinary, banal, and uninteresting, Tuan points out that "To the young child, [home] is not only a familiar and nurturing place, it is also a space that invites exploration. Grown-ups forget that, when they were little, a trip to the attic or basement could be an adventure and that camping overnight in the backyard had the same sort of thrill they now have camping in the wilds of the Adirondacks or Alaska" (2004, p. 8). There is nothing within these spaces then that precludes engagements with novelty or adventure or change. De Maistre's journey around his bedroom also illustrates a different kind of adventurous engagement within a familiar space (1984, see discussion later in this chapter).

[lii] One factor that has been used to separate these experiences as non-touristic and touristic is the ethical stance that tourists are seen to occupy. Svenson argues that tourists are different because they have no commitment or responsibility to the communities they visit (2004, p. 73). Many everyday practices such as buying exotic fruits, however, can be marked by a similar lack of responsibility. Indeed, individuals' lack of understanding of the transport and resources involved in getting food to local supermarkets shows a gaping hole in their ethical awareness and responsibility even to their own communities. Furthermore, newer forms of tourism such as sustainable ecotourism are characterized by a concern for the communities and ecosystems they are situated within. The issue of how tourism is related to social responsibility, therefore, must be considered further and in conjunction with considerations of how social responsibility exists in everyday interactions and communities.

[liii] De Maistre's 'Voyages autour de ma chambre' and 'Expédition nocturne autour de ma chambre' involve imaginative travel into his memories and philosophical musings during two periods in which he spends several weeks confined to his apartment. He lays out

moral and philosophical beliefs and uses immutable mobiles, such as the paintings on his walls, objects in his desk, and other objects he names as souvenirs (De Maistre, 1984, pp. 82-83), to spark engagements with significant places and people in his life. "An inanimate object, a picture, gives rise to a withdrawal into the past. On another occasion external stimuli might precipitate a series of speculations on the future in light of the knowing subject's past and present experiences" (Lombard, 1977, p. 29). Interestingly, he makes the argument that this form of travel is superior because of its inherent accessibility to all people, regardless of their stature in life. He says that anyone can use his "system", whether "rich or poor, young or old, born in an equatorial zone or near a pole, he can travel like me" (De Maistre, 1984, p. 31, translated by author).

[liv] This guide contains many other interesting examples of experimental travel at home. 'Backpacking at home' has you starting out at the airport in your own city with a full complement of backpacking equipment, and then living in your city as you would if you were a backpacker in a foreign city – talking with people at hostels, taking tours, eating cheap food, and frequenting internet cafés (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 66) In 'Domestic travel', you trade houses with a friend and then try to live a weekend as your friend would while in his or her space (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 114). For 'Synchronized travel', you gather a group of friends and, starting at different points in your city, follow a set of 10 pre-planned walking directions, seeing if your paths ever cross: "Synchronised – or parallel – Travel enables you to see your own city with fresh eyes, without breaking your budget. It's also a very useful means of showing your city to friends from afar – or enjoying a holiday together, while apart! While this experiment includes photography, you don't have to take photos. Instead, you could do a dance, strike a pose, write a poem, enjoy a quiet moment or do nothing at all" (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 213). Finally, there is 'Voyage to the end of the line', where you do just that on any form of transport, seeing what you notice when you go somewhere you don't normally visit (Antony and Henry, 2005, p. 242).

[lv] Dürrschmidt notes that "what is considered to be 'home' largely derives from the person's ability to generate a special relationship to a place, less from the physical setting of the place" (1997, p. 64).

[lvi] Haldrup also uses two other categories to characterize mobilities: navigating and dwelling. Navigating involves the more traditional practice of consuming sites and sights, and thus necessitates figuring out how best to get to these sites. Dwelling was found to occur in conjunction with both other types, and is more concerned with the reward that comes from personal movement and drifting (Haldrup, 2004, p. 449). This approach of determining the orientations of mobilities could be useful in future studies that examine tourism over the course of many different spaces within individual mobilities.

[lvii] The cases of this study also often emphasize inhabiting, and in both of MacGregor's texts he highlights the importance of performing mundane activities in the presence of family (MacGregor, 2002, 2005).

[lviii] It is also worth noting that travellers can be denied the opportunity to create places of home. Blaise and Mukherjee find themselves frustrated because while living in Mukherjee's parents' home, they are unable to place and order space as they wish (1977). Doodoo, Mukherjee's father, places severe restrictions on their mobility, while Mommy-

di, Mukherjee's mother, constrains their use of the space of the house. Thus, their lack of control and power in the space contributes to their understanding of it as Doodoo's home, and prevents them from undertaking practices that might articulate it as a home of their own.

[lix] Crenshaw highlights the way in which minority women are more vulnerable to rape and abuse, while also being the victims of biased treatment in political spheres. The dynamics of ideologies of race and sex, for example, have affected political and legal institutions so that Black women who are raped are less likely than other women to have their rapists charged or convicted (1991).

Bhattacharjee highlights the way in which the intersectional identities of domestic workers, and other South Asian women immigrants in the United States, challenges the divisions of public and private (1997). She illustrates how immigration policies mark the entire nation as private space that is strictly controlled, and yet the privileges of being part of this private group can be erased at another scale, where men are allowed to control their wives within the privacy of their own homes. The issue of rights for domestic workers is also heavily contested because these women's workspace is a private home. The boundaries of home can thus be re-drawn, and doing so can severely disadvantage particular groups of women.

[lx] The notable emphasis upon positive experiences and unique experiences in these texts must also be noted, and can be seen as a function of genre and social context. As the texts belong to the genre of travel writing, they come to support institutionalized facets of this genre, most notably the positive valuation of travel. Travel writing is often highly personal, and generally serves to encourage travel by painting it in a positive light. Doing so is not only beneficial to the publishing industry, which markets travel writing as light, unique, and upbeat, but also to the social position of the narrators. The social context of travel memoirs is often one that is closely connected to the practice of telling family and friends stories after returning from travel, and this practice is connected to the naming and claiming of social capital. As such, travelling and the constructing of narratives of travel can become practices "undertaken with an eye to a future audience back home, one we hope to impress or amuse" (Franklin and Crang, 2001, p. 16). As such, travellers are likely to downplay problems and challenges from their travels because, unless they make a good story, these will decrease the valuation of social capital gained from travel. Related to this is the tendency to highlight the most unusual components of travel because these not only are more valuable social experiences to claim, but they also highlight the exceptionality of the spaces and places inhabited, and thus increase the value of having personally experienced things unusual and disconnected from banal everyday spheres. Though the extent to which such factors affect narratives is unclear, this study uses narratives for theoretical inspiration and engagement, and as a result concerns over the correspondence of narrative and authentic experience are notable but not fatal.

Bibliography

Ahmed, S., et al. (2003) Introduction: Uprootings/regroundings: questions of home and migration, in S. Ahmed, et al. (Eds.) *Uprootings/regroundings: questions of home and migration*, pp. 1-19 (Oxford: Berg).

Albarre, G. (1977) The impact of second homes: second homes and conservation in Southern Belgium, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 139-146 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Albrow, M. (1997) Travelling beyond local cultures: socioscapes in a global city, in J. Eade (Ed.) *Living the global city: globalization as a local process*, pp. 37-55 (London: Routledge).

Albrow, M., et al. (1997) The impact of globalization on sociological concepts: community, culture and milieu, in J. Eade (Ed.) *Living the global city: globalization as a local process*, pp. 20-36 (London: Routledge).

Aldskogius, H. (1969) *Modelling the evolution of settlement patterns: two studies of vacation house settlement* (Geografiska Regionstudier No. 6; Uppsala: Utgivna av Kulturgeografiska institutionen vid Uppsala Universitet).

American Society of Planning Officials (1976), Subdividing rural America: impacts of recreational lot and second home development, (Washington: Council on Environmental Quality; Office of Policy Development and Research; Department of Housing and Urban Development; Appalachian Regional Commission).

Anonymous (1989) *Cottage country: an environmental manual for cottagers* (Sixth edn.; Toronto: Environment Ontario).

Antony, R. and Henry, J. (2005) *The Lonely Planet Guide to Experimental Travel* (London: Lonely Planet Publications).

Aronsson, L. (2004) Place attachment of vacation residents: between tourists and permanent residents, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 75-86 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Augé, M. (1995) *Non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*, trans. J. Howe (New York: Verso).

Bainbridge, J. (2002) *Above the sea: expat in China* (New York: Writers Club Press).

Barke, M. and France, L.A. (1988) Second homes in the Balearic Islands, *Geography* 73 (2), pp. 143-145.

Bell, M. and Ward, G. (2000) Comparing temporary mobility with permanent migration, *Tourism Geographies* 2 (1), pp. 87-107.

Bell, M. and Brown, D. (2006) Who are the visitors? Characteristics of temporary movers in Australia, *Population, space and place* 12 (2), pp. 77-92.

Bhattacharjee, A. (1997) The public/private mirage: mapping homes and undomesticating violence work in the South Asian immigrant community, in M.J. Alexander and C.T. Mohanty (Eds.) *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*, pp. 308-329 (New York: Routledge).

Bielckus, C.L. (1977) Second homes in Scandinavia, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 35-46 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Bielckus, C.L., Rogers, A.W., and Wibberley, G.P. (1972), Second homes in England and Wales, *Studies in Rural Land Use Report No. 11* (Kent: School of Rural Economics and Related Studies, Wye College).

Blaise, C. and Mukherjee, B. (1977) *Days and nights in Calcutta* (New York: Doubleday).

Bodewes, T. (1981) Development of advanced tourism studies in Holland, *Annals of Tourism Research* 8 (1), pp. 35-51.

Brah, A. and Phoenix, A. (2004) Ain't I a woman? Revisiting intersectionality, *Journal of International Women's Studies* 5 (3), pp. 75-86.

Brand, D. (2001) *A map to the door of no return: notes to belonging* (Toronto: Doubleday).

Burkart, A.J. and Medlik, S. (1981) *Tourism: past, present, and future* (Second edn.; London: William Heinemann).

Burman, J. (2006a) Absence, "removal," and everyday life in the diasporic city: antidetention/deportation activism in Montréal, *Space and Culture* 10 (10), pp. 1-15.

--- (2006b) Co-motion in the diasporic city, in C. Teelucksingh (Ed.) *Claiming space: racialization in Canadian cities*, pp. 101-120 (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press).

Cartier, C. (2005) Introduction: touristed landscapes/seductions of place, in C. Cartier and A.A. Lew (Eds.) *Seductions of place: geographical perspectives on globalization and touristed landscapes*, pp. 1-19 (Critical Geographies; New York: Routledge).

Casado-Diaz, M.A. (2004) Second homes in Spain, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 215-232 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Castells, M. (2000) *The rise of network society* (New York: Blackwell).

Chambers, I. (1994) *Migrancy, culture, identity* (London: Routledge).

Chiang, Y. (1977) *China revisited, after forty-two years* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co.).

Clout, H.D. (1977) Résidences secondaire in France, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 47-62 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Cohen, E. (1974) Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification, *Sociological Review* 22 (4), pp. 527-555.

--- (1979) A phenomenology of tourist experiences, *Sociology* 13 (2), pp. 179-201.

Cohen, E., Ben-Yehuda, N., and Aviad, J. (1987) Recentering the world: the quest for 'elective' centers in a secularized universe, *The Sociological Review* 35 (2), pp. 320-346.

Coles, T., Duval, D.T., and Hall, C.M. (2005) Tourism, mobility, and global communities: new approaches to theorizing tourism and tourist spaces, in W.F. Theobald (Ed.) *Global Tourism*, pp. 463-481 (3rd edn.; New York: Elsevier).

Conway, D. (2005) Transnationalism and return: 'home' as an enduring fixture and 'anchor', in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 263-281 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Conway, D., Potter, R.B., and Phillips, J. (2005) The experience of return: Caribbean return migrants, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 1-25 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Coppock, J.T. (1977a) Second homes in perspective, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 1-15 (Oxford: Pergamon).

--- (1977b) The impact of second homes: social implications of second homes in Mid- and North Wales, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 147-153 (Oxford: Pergamon).

--- (Ed.) (1977c) *Second homes: curse or blessing?* (Oxford: Pergamon).

Craik, J. (1997) The culture of tourism, in C. Rojek and J. Urry (Eds.) *Touring Cultures: transformations of travel and theory*, pp. 113-136 (New York: Routledge).

Crang, M. (2006) Circulation and emplacement: the hollowed-out performance of tourism, in C. Minca and T. Oakes (Eds.) *Travels in paradox: remapping tourism*, pp. 47-64 (Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers).

Crenshaw, K. (1991) Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color, *Stanford Law Review* 43, pp. 1241-1299.

Crouch, D. (2005) Flirting with space: Tourism geographies as sensuous/expressive practice, in C. Cartier and A.A. Lew (Eds.) *Seductions of place: geographical*

perspectives on globalization and touristed landscapes, pp. 23-35 (Critical Geographies; New York: Routledge).

--- (Ed.) (1999) *Leisure/tourism geographies: practices and geographical knowledge*, Eds. T. Skelton and G. Valentine (Critical Geographies, New York: Routledge).

Dawson, A. and Johnson, M. (2004) Migration, exile and landscapes of the imagination, in S. Cairns (Ed.) *Drifting: architecture and migrancy*, pp. 116-127 (The architext series; London: Routledge).

De Maistre, X. (1984) *Nouvelles* (Genève: Editions Slatkine).

De Souza, R.-M. (2005) No place like home: returnee R&R (retention and rejection) in the Caribbean homeland, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 135-156 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

de Vane, R. (1975) *Second home ownership: a case study*, ed. J. Revell (Bangor occasional papers in economics; Cardiff: University of Wales Press).

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.) (2005) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd edn., Thousand Oaks: Sage).

Dijst, M., et al. (2005) Second homes in Germany and the Netherlands: ownership and travel impact explained, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 96 (2), pp. 139-152.

Dower, M. (1977) Planning aspects of second homes, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 155-164 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Downing, J.C. (1986), Lakeshore capacity study: committee report, (Toronto: Ministry of Municipal Affairs: Research and Special Projects Branch).

Dürrschmidt, J. (1997) The delinking of locale and milieu: on the situatedness of extended milieux in a global environment, in J. Eade (Ed.) *Living the global city: globalization as a local process*, pp. 56-72 (London: Routledge).

Duval, D.T. (2002) The return visit-return migration connection, in C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (Eds.) *Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption*, pp. 257-276 (London: Kluwer Academic).

--- (2004a) Mobile migrants: travel to second homes, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 87-96 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

--- (2004b) Conceptualizing return visits: a transnational perspective, in T. Coles and D. Timothy (Eds.) *Tourism, diasporas and space*, pp. 50-61 (London: Routledge).

--- (2005) Expressions of migrant mobilities among Caribbean migrants in Toronto, Canada, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 245-261 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and social change* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

--- (2003) *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research* (London: Routledge).

Fennell, G. (1997) Local lives - distant ties: researching community under globalized conditions, in J. Eade (Ed.) *Living the global city: globalization as a local process*, pp. 90-109 (London: Routledge).

Flognfeldt, T. (2002) Second-home ownership: a sustainable semi-migration, in C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (Eds.) *Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption*, pp. 187-204 (London: Kluwer Academic).

Flognfeldt, T.J. (2004) Second homes as a part of a new rural lifestyle in Norway, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 233-243 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Fortier, A.-M. (1999) Re-membering places and the performance of belonging(s), *Theory, Culture and Society* 16 (2), pp. 41-64.

--- (2001) 'Coming home': queer migrations and multiple evocations of home, *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 4 (4), pp. 405-424.

--- (2003) Making home: queer migrations and motions of attachment, in S. Ahmed, et al. (Eds.) *Uprootings/regroundings: questions of home and migration*, pp. 115-135 (Oxford: Berg).

Franklin, A. (2003) *Tourism: an introduction* (London: Sage).

Franklin, A. and Crang, M. (2001) The trouble with tourism and travel theory?, *Tourist Studies* 1 (1), pp. 5-22.

Freeman, J. (2002) Democracy and danger on the beach: class relations in the public space of Rio de Janeiro, *Space and Culture* 5 (1), pp. 9-28.

Fridgen, J.D. (1984) Environmental psychology and tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research* 11, pp. 19-39.

Frost, W. (2004) A hidden giant: second homes and coastal tourism in South-Eastern Australia, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 162-173 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Gable, S. and Gable, C.I. (2005) *Palladian days: finding a new life in a Venetian country house* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Gallent, N., Mace, A., and Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2003) Dispelling a myth? Second homes in rural Wales, *Area* 35 (3), pp. 271-284.

Gardavský, V. (1977) Second homes in Czechoslovakia, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 63-74 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Gartner, W.C. (1987) Environmental impacts of recreational home developments, *Annals of Tourism Research* 14 (1), pp. 38-57.

Ghosh, B. (Ed.) (2000) *Return migration: journey of hope or despair?* (Geneva: International Organization for Migration and the United Nations).

Girard, T.C. and Gartner, W.C. (1993) Second home second view: host community perceptions, *Annals of Tourism Research* 20, pp. 685-700.

Gordon, C. (1989) *At the cottage* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart).

--- (2006) *Still at the cottage* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart).

Gough, K. (2007), Thinking geographically about house and home panel, paper given at Association of American Geographers 2007 Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, April 21, 2007.

Greenblat, C.S. and Gagnon, J.H. (1983) Temporary strangers: travel and tourism from a sociological perspective, *Sociological Perspectives* 26 (1), pp. 89-110.

Grewal, I. (1996) *Home and harem: nation, gender, empire, and the cultures of travel* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Gustafson, P. (2006) Place attachment and mobility, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 17-31 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Haldrup, M. (2004) Laid-back mobilities: second-home holidays in time and space, *Tourism Geographies* 6 (4), pp. 434-454.

Hall, C.M. (2005a) Time, space, tourism and social physics, *Tourism Recreation Research* 30 (1), pp. 93-98.

--- (2005b) Reconsidering the geography of tourism and contemporary mobility, *Geographical Research* 43 (2), pp. 125-139.

--- (2006), 'You won't be interested in that': using family history to chart mobility biographies and generational effects over the lifecourse, paper given at E-CLAT Climate Change and Tourism Conference: tourism and climate change mitigation, Westelbeers, Netherlands, June 11-14 2006.

Hall, C.M. and Page, S.J. (2001) *Geography of tourism and recreation: environment, place and space* (2nd edn.; New York: Routledge).

Hall, C.M. and Williams, A.M. (2002a) Tourism, migration, circulation and mobility: the contingencies of time and place, in C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (Eds.) *Tourism*

and migration: new relationships between production and consumption, pp. 1-52 (London: Kluwer Academic).

Hall, C.M. and Müller, D.K. (2004a) Introduction: second homes, cure or blessing? Revisited, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 3-14 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Hall, C.M. and Williams, A.M. (Eds.) (2002b) *Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption* (London: Kluwer Academic).

Hall, C.M. and Müller, D.K. (Eds.) (2004b) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, Eds. C. Cooper, C.M. Hall, and D. Timothy (Aspects of Tourism, Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Halseth, G. (1998) *Cottage country in transition: a social geography of change and contention in the rural-recreational countryside* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press).

--- (2004) The 'cottage' privilege: increasingly elite landscapes of second homes in Canada, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 35-54 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Halseth, G. and Rosenberg, M. (1990) Conversion of recreational residences: a case study of its measurement and management, *Canadian Journal of Regional Science* 13 (1), pp. 99-115.

Hammond, L. (2004) Tigrayan returnees' notions of home: five variations on a theme, in F. Markowitz and A.H. Stefansson (Eds.) *Homecomings: unsettling paths of return*, pp. 36-53 (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books).

Hastrup, K. and Olwig, K.F. (1997) Introduction, in K.F. Olwig and K. Hastrup (Eds.) *Siting culture: the shifting anthropological object*, pp. 1-14 (New York: Routledge).

Henshall, J.D. (1977) Second homes in the Caribbean, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 75-84 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Hetherington, K. (1997) In place of geometry: the materiality of place, in K. Hetherington and R. Munro (Eds.) *Ideas of difference*, pp. 183-199 (Oxford: Blackwell).

Hiebert, D. and Ley, D. (2006) Characteristics of immigrant transnationalism in Vancouver, in V. Satzewich and L. Wong (Eds.) *Transnational identities and practices in Canada*, pp. 71-90 (Vancouver: UBC Press).

Hoggart, K. and Buller, H. (1995) British home owners and housing change in rural France, *Housing Studies* 10 (2), pp. 179-198.

Holland, P. and Huggan, G. (1998) *Tourists with typewriters: critical reflections on contemporary travel writing* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Holsey, B. (2004) Transatlantic dreaming: slavery, tourism, and diasporic encounters, in F. Markowitz and A.H. Stefansson (Eds.) *Homecomings: unsettling paths of return*, pp. 166-182 (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books).

Hoogendoorn, G., Mellett, R., and Visser, G. (2005) Second homes tourism in Africa: reflections on the South African experience, *Urban Forum* 16 (2/3), pp. 112-154.

Jaakson, R. (1986) Second-home domestic tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research* 13, pp. 367-391.

Jacobs, C.A.J. (1972), Second homes in Denbighshire, *Tourism and Recreation Research Report 3* (County of Denbigh).

Jarlöv, L. (1999) Leisure lots and summer cottages as places for people's own creative work, in D. Crouch (Ed.) *Leisure/tourism geographies: practices and geographical knowledge*, pp. 231-237 (Critical Geographies; New York: Routledge).

Kaltenborn, B.P. (1997) Nature of place attachment: a study among recreation homeowners in Southern Norway, *Leisure Sciences* 19, pp. 175-189.

Kaplan, C. (2003) Transporting the subject: technologies of mobility and location in an era of globalization, in S. Ahmed, et al. (Eds.) *Uprootings/regroundings: questions of home and migration*, pp. 207-223 (Oxford: Berg).

Keen, D. and Hall, C.M. (2004) Second homes in New Zealand, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 174-195 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Key, F.S. (1814), The Star Spangled Banner.

Kibria, N. (2002) Of blood, belonging, and homeland trips: transnationalism and identity among second-generation Chinese and Korean Americans, in P. Levitt and M.C. Waters (Eds.) *The changing face of home: the transnational lives of the second generation*, pp. 295-311 (New York: Russell Sage Foundation).

King, R. (2000) Generalizations from the history of return migration, in B. Ghosh (Ed.) *Return migration: journey of hope or despair?*, pp. 7-55 (Geneva: International Organization for Migration and the United Nations).

Koskela, H. (1997) 'Bold walk and breakings': women's spatial confidence versus fear of violence, *Gender, Place and Culture* 4 (2), pp. 301-319.

--- (1999) 'Gendered exclusions': women's fear of violence and changing relations to space, *Geografiska Annaler* 81 B (2), pp. 111-124.

Kreutzwiser, R.D. and Nelson, J.G. (1975), Vacation home occupance of hazard lands in Canada: flood and erosion hazards, (Outdoor Recreation - Open Space Division, Land Use Studies Branch, Lands Directorate, Environment Canada).

Larsen, J., Urry, J., and Axhausen, K. (2006) *Mobilities, networks, geographies* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate).

Latour, B. (1988) Drawing things together, in M. Lynch and S. Woolgar (Eds.) *Representation in scientific practice*, pp. 19-68 (First MIT Press 1990 edn.; Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press).

Lee, R.W., Ramsey, R.H., and Urban, L.V. (1978), Environmental guidelines for second home developments in mountain areas, *Eisenhower Consortium Institutional Series Report No.3* (Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech University, Water Resources Center).

Levitt, P. and Waters, M.C. (2002) Introduction, in P. Levitt and M.C. Waters (Eds.) *The changing face of home: the transnational lives of the second generation*, pp. 1-30 (New York: Russell Sage Foundation).

Levy, A. (2004) Homecoming to the diaspora: nation and state in visits of Israelis to Morocco, in F. Markowitz and A.H. Stefansson (Eds.) *Homecomings: unsettling paths of return*, pp. 92-108 (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books).

Lew, A.A. and Wong, A. (2004) Sojourners, *guanxi* and clan associations: social capital and overseas Chinese tourism to China, in T. Coles and D. Timothy (Eds.) *Tourism, diasporas and space*, pp. 202-214 (London: Routledge).

--- (2005) Existential tourism and the homeland: the overseas Chinese experience, in C. Cartier and A.A. Lew (Eds.) *Seductions of place: geographical perspectives on globalization and touristed landscapes*, pp. 286-300 (Critical Geographies; New York: Routledge).

Liu, H. (2005) *The transnational history of a Chinese family: immigrant letters, family business, and reverse migration* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press).

Lombard, C.M. (1977) *Xavier de Maistre* (Boston: Twayne Publishers).

Long, L.D. (2004) Viet Kieu on a fast track back?, in L.D. Long and E. Oxfeld (Eds.) *Coming home? Refugees, migrants, and those who stayed behind*, pp. 65-89 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Louie, A. (2003) When you are related to the 'other': (re)locating the Chinese homeland in Asian American politics through cultural tourism, *Positions* 11 (3), pp. 735-763.

Lozanovska, M. (2002) The migrants' daughter's study, *Space and Culture* 5 (3), pp. 265-277.

MacCannell, D. (1976) *The tourist: a new theory of the leisure class* (New York: Schocken Books).

Macfarlane, D. (1999) *Summer gone* (paperback edition 2000 edn.; Toronto: Vintage Canada).

MacGregor, R. (2002) *Escape: in search of the natural soul of Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.).

--- (2005) *The weekender: a cottage journal* (Toronto: Penguin).

Maddern, J. (2004) The 'isle of home' is always on your mind: subjectivity and space at Ellis Island Immigration Museum, in T. Coles and D. Timothy (Eds.) *Tourism, diasporas and space*, pp. 153-171 (London: Routledge).

McDowell, L. (1999) *Gender, identity and place: understanding feminist geographies* (Cambridge: Polity).

McHugh, K.E. (2006) Nomads of desire, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 51-66 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

McIntyre, N., Williams, D.R., and McHugh, K.E. (2006a) Multiple dwelling: prospect and retrospect, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 313-322 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

--- (Eds.) (2006b) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity* (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Merriman, P. (2004) Driving places: Marc Augé, non-places, and the geographies of England's M1 motorway, *Theory, Culture and Society* 21 (4/5), pp. 145-167.

Mosedale, J. (2007), Commodity chains and the mobility turn in tourism, paper given at Association of American Geographers 2007 Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, April 17, 2007.

Mottiar, Z. and Quinn, B. (2003) Shaping leisure/tourism places - the role of holiday home owners: a case study of Courtown, Co. Wexford, Ireland, *Leisure Studies* 22, pp. 109-127.

Müller, D.K. (2002) German second home development in Sweden, in C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (Eds.) *Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption*, pp. 169-186 (London: Kluwer Academic).

--- (2004) Second homes in Sweden: patterns and issues, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 244-258 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

--- (2006) The attractiveness of second home areas in Sweden: a quantitative analysis, *Current Issues in Tourism* 9 (4/5), pp. 335-350.

Müller, D.K., Hall, C.M., and Keen, D. (2004) Second home tourism impact, planning and management, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 15-32 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Nguyen, T.-H. and King, B. (2002) Migrant communities and tourism consumption: the case of the Vietnamese in Australia, in C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (Eds.) *Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption*, pp. 221-240 (London: Kluwer Academic).

--- (2004) The culture of tourism in the diaspora: the case of the Vietnamese community in Australia, in T. Coles and D. Timothy (Eds.) *Tourism, diasporas and space*, pp. 172-187 (London: Routledge).

O'Reilly, K. (2003) When is a tourist? The articulation of tourism and migration in Spain's Costa del Sol, *Tourist Studies* 3 (3), pp. 301-317.

Olwig, K.F. (1997) Cultural sites: sustaining a home in a deterritorialized world, in K.F. Olwig and K. Hastrup (Eds.) *Siting culture: the shifting anthropological object*, pp. 17-38 (New York: Routledge).

Oxfeld, E. (2001) Imaginary homecomings: Chinese villagers, their overseas relations, and social capital, *Journal of Socio-Economics* 30, pp. 181-186.

--- (2004) Chinese villagers and the moral dilemmas of return visits, in L.D. Long and E. Oxfeld (Eds.) *Coming home? Refugees, migrants, and those who stayed behind*, pp. 90-103 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Oxfeld, E. and Long, L.D. (2004) Introduction: an ethnography of return, in L.D. Long and E. Oxfeld (Eds.) *Coming home? Refugees, migrants, and those who stayed behind*, pp. 1-15 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Panelli, R., Little, J., and Kraack, A. (2004) A community issue? Rural women's feelings of safety and fear in New Zealand, *Gender, Place and Culture* 11 (3), pp. 445-467.

Periäinen, K. (2006) The summer cottage: a dream in the Finnish forest, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 103-113 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Perkins, H.C. and Thorns, D.C. (2006) Home away from home: the primary/second-home relationship, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 67-81 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Perniola, M. (2001) *Ritual thinking: sexuality, death, world*, trans. M. Verdicchio (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books).

Phillips, M. (1990) *I saw three Chinas* (Victoria, BC: Orca Book Publishers).

Potter, J. (1996) *Representing reality: discourse, rhetoric, and social construction* (London: Sage).

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1994) Analysing discourse, in A. Bryman and R. Burgess (Eds.) *Analyzing qualitative data*, pp. 47-66 (London: Routledge).

Potter, R.B. (2005a) The socio-demographic characteristics of second generation return migrants to St Lucia and Barbados, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 27-47 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

--- (2005b) 'Tales of two societies': narratives of adjustment among second generation return migrants to St Lucia and Barbados, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 49-67 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Potter, R.B., Conway, D., and Phillips, J. (Eds.) (2005) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Pratt, M.L. (1992) *Imperial eyes: travel writing and transculturation* (London: Routledge).

Preston, V., Kobayashi, A., and Siemiatycki, M. (2006) Transnational urbanism: Toronto at a crossroads, in V. Satzewich and L. Wong (Eds.) *Transnational identities and practices in Canada*, pp. 91-110 (Vancouver: UBC Press).

Priddle, G. and Kreutzwiser, R. (1977) Evaluating cottage environments in Ontario, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 165-179 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Quinn, D. and Turley, D. (2005) Touristic transcendence and post modern flitting: an exploration of the experiences of second home owners, *Tourism* 53 (4), pp. 301-310.

Ragatz, R.L. (1977) Vacation homes in rural areas: towards a model for predicting their distribution and occupancy patterns, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 181-193 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Ragatz, R.L. and Gelb, G.M. (1970) The quiet boom in the vacation home market, *California Management Review* 12 (3), pp. 57-64.

Ragatz, R.L. and Cordell, H.K. (1980), A comprehensive bibliography on vacation homes and recreational lands in the United States, in United States Department of Agriculture (ed.), (Forest Service Research Paper SE- 202: Southeastern Forest Experiment Station: Asheville, N.C.).

Ritzer, G. and Liska, A. (1997) 'McDisneyization' and 'Post-tourism': Complementary perspectives on contemporary tourism, in C. Rojek and J. Urry (Eds.) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*, pp. 96-109 (New York: Routledge).

Robertson, R.W. (1977) Second-home decisions: the Australian context, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 119-138 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Rodman, J. and Conway, D. (2005) The nexus and the family tree: return migration to Grenada and transnationalism in context, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 89-108 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Rogers, A.W. (1977) Second homes in England and Wales: a spatial view, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 85-102 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Rojek, C. (1997) Indexing, dragging and the social construction of tourist sights, in C. Rojek and J. Urry (Eds.) *Touring cultures: transformations of travel and theory*, pp. 52-74 (London: Routledge).

Rojek, C. and Urry, J. (1997) Transformations of travel and theory, in C. Rojek and J. Urry (Eds.) *Touring Cultures: transformations of travel and theory*, pp. 1-22 (New York: Routledge).

Satzewich, V. and Wong, L. (Eds.) (2006) *Transnational identities and practices in Canada* (Vancouver: UBC Press).

Selwood, J. and Tonts, M. (2004) Recreational second homes in the South West of Western Australia, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 149-161 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Shields, R. (1991) *Places on the margin: alternative geographies of modernity* (London: Routledge).

--- (2003) *The virtual*, ed. P. Hamilton (Key ideas; New York: Routledge).

St. Bernard, G. (2005) Return migration to Trinidad and Tobago: motives, consequences and the prospects of re-migration, in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (Eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*, pp. 157-182 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate).

Stedman, R.C. (2006) Places of escape: second-home meanings in Northern Wisconsin, USA, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 129-144 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Sudnow, D. (1979) *Talk's body: a meditation between two keyboards* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Svenson, S. (2004) The cottage and the city: an interpretation of the Canadian second home experience, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 55-74 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Timothy, D. (2004) Recreational second homes in the United States: development issues and contemporary patterns, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 133-148 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Timothy, D. and Teye, V.B. (2004) American children of the African diaspora: journeys to the motherland, in T. Coles and D. Timothy (Eds.) *Tourism, diasporas and space*, pp. 111-123 (London: Routledge).

Tuan, Y.-F. (1977) *Space and place: the perspective of experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

--- (2004) *Place, art, and self* (Santa Fe, New Mexico: Center for American Places).

Tuulentie, S. (2006) Tourists making themselves at home: second homes as a part of tourist careers, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 145-157 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Urry, J. (1990) *The tourist gaze: leisure and travel in contemporary societies*, ed. M. Featherstone (Theory, Culture & Society; London: Sage).

--- (1995) *Consuming places* (New York: Routledge).

Van Den Abbeele, G. (1992) *Travel as metaphor: from Montaigne to Rousseau* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

Virilio, P. (1997) *Open sky*, trans. J. Rose (London: Verso).

Visser, G. (2004) Second homes: reflections on an unexplored phenomenon in South Africa, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 196-214 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Weir, R.S. (1908), O Canada.

Wesely, J.K. and Gaarder, E. (2004) The gendered 'nature' of the urban outdoors: women negotiating fear of violence, *Gender and Society* 18 (5), pp. 645-663.

Wigley, M. (1992) Untitled: the housing of gender, in B. Colomina (Ed.) *Sexuality and space*, pp. 327-389 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press).

Williams, A.M. and Hall, C.M. (2000) Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption, *Tourism Geographies* 2 (1), pp. 5-27.

Williams, A.M., King, R., and Warnes, T. (2004) British second homes in southern Europe: shifting nodes in the scapes and flows of migration and tourism, in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (Eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*, pp. 97-112 (Aspects of Tourism; Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications).

Williams, D.R. (2002) Leisure identities, globalization, and the politics of place, *Journal of Leisure Research* 34 (4), pp. 351-367.

Williams, D.R. and Kaltenborn, B.P. (1999) Leisure places and modernity: the use and meaning of recreational cottages in Norway and the USA, in D. Crouch (Ed.) *Leisure/tourism geographies: practices and geographical knowledge*, pp. 214-230 (Critical Geographies; New York: Routledge).

Williams, D.R. and Van Patten, S.R. (2006) Home *and* away? Creating identities and sustaining places in a multi-centred world, in N. McIntyre, D.R. Williams, and K.E. McHugh (Eds.) *Multiple dwelling and tourism: negotiating place, home and identity*, pp. 32-50 (Cambridge, MA: CABI).

Williams, S. (2003) *Tourism and recreation*, ed. S.J. Page (Themes in tourism; Toronto: Pearson Education Limited).

Wolfe, R.I. (1951) Summer cottagers in Ontario, *Economic Geography* 27 (1), pp. 10-32.

--- (1952) Wasaga beach: the divorce from the geographic environment, *Canadian Geographer* 1 (2), pp. 57-65.

--- (1965) About cottages and cottagers, *Landscape* 15 (1), pp. 6-8.

--- (1970) Discussion of vacation homes, environmental preferences and spatial behaviour, *Journal of Leisure Research* 2 (1), pp. 85-87.

--- (1977) Summer cottages in Ontario: purpose-built for an inessential purpose, in J.T. Coppock (Ed.) *Second homes: curse or blessing?*, pp. 17-33 (Oxford: Pergamon).

Wolff, J. (1993) On the road again: metaphors of travel in cultural criticism, *Cultural Studies* 7 (2), pp. 224-239.

World Tourism Organization (2005), Adapting the national tourism satellite account (TSA) project to subnational levels: a discussion paper, (Madrid: World Tourism Organization Department of Statistics and Economic Measurement of Tourism,).

Zournazi, M. (2002) *Hope: new philosophies for change* (published in Canada in 2003 edn.; New York: Routledge).